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, 23, 24, 25)
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, 23, 24, 25)
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
70% of students correctly answered the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
70% of students correctly answered the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
60% of students correctly answered the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
60% of students correctly answered the exam questions related to this measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Acct 2102: Document accounting usefulness (O: 1, 2)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 2102: Document the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% of students need to correctly answer exam questions related to this measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students correctly answered the exam questions related to this measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% of the students correctly answered the exam questions related to this measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Acct 2101: Interpret financial transaction effects (O: 1, 2)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 2101: Interpret the financial impact of transactions, including revenue recognition and capitalization; complete steps in the accounting cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Acct 2101: Perform basic accounting calculations (O: 1)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 2101: Perform basic calculations for allowance accounts, inventory costing, and depreciation of fixed assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 76%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Acct 2101: Prepare financial statements (O: 1)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 93%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Acct 4210: Develop performance measures (O: 1, 2)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4210: Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation, and control of organizations’ business processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 85%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for <strong>O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></td>
<td>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 85%.</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 <strong>O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></th>
<th>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 84%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></th>
<th>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 84%.</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 <strong>O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></th>
<th>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 79%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></th>
<th>A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 79%.</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 <strong>O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></th>
<th>Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case). Better than prior year’s performance for set 2 (BloomScape case).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>For set 1, least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 9.8% higher in Fall 2006 than in Fall 2005. For set 2, an integrative exam encompassing all the learning outcomes, least squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 17% higher in Fall 2006 than in Fall 2005.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></th>
<th>Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case). Better than prior year’s performance for set 2 (BloomScape case).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>For set 1, least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 9.8% higher in Fall 2006 than in Fall 2005. For set 2, an integrative exam encompassing all the learning outcomes, least squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 17% higher in Fall 2006 than in Fall 2005.</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 <strong>O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge</strong></th>
<th>Equivalent to or better than prior year’s performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Acct 4310: Design and implement databases (O: 1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acct 4310: Design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

Better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

Scores were on average 17% higher in fall 2006 relative to fall 2005.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

Better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

Scores were on average 17% higher in fall 2006 relative to fall 2005.

<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>

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

Existing norm for the X-Oil case

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met

A new case was developed. The case turned out to be more appropriate for graduate students because of its complexity.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

Existing norm for the X-Oil case

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met

A new case was developed. The case turned out to be more appropriate for graduate students because of its complexity.

<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>

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

Mean score was 72%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

Mean score was 72%.

<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>

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

Mean score was 72%.
Mean score was 73%.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 73%.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 65%

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Mean score was 65%

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 82%.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 82%.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 80%.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 80%.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 75%.
### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 75%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 77%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Mean score was 77%.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 77%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 90%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Mean score was 90%.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 90%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 78%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Mean score was 78%.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 78%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 23: Acct 4410: Read and interpret financial statements (O: 1, 2)
Acct 4110: Read and interpret financial statements and use footnote data to analyze accounts receivable, inventory, depreciable assets, and operating leases.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

### Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
Mean score of 75% on exam questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
Mean score of 75% on exam questions

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: **Met**
Mean score of 76%

#### M 24: Acct 4410: Perform financial statement analysis (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4410: Perform financial statement analysis including vertical and horizontal analysis, ratio analysis, and analysis of profitability, liquidity and solvency.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

Mean score of 75% on exam questions

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: **Not Met**
Mean score of 74%

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

Mean score of 75% on exam questions

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: **Not Met**
Mean score of 74%

#### M 25: Acct 4410: Access sources of financial information (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4410: Access sources of financial and operational information including industry data and statistics: 10Ks and 10Qs, newspaper articles, business magazines, library sources, and internet sources.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A score of at least 75% on individual projects.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: **Met**
Mean score was 78%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

A score of at least 75% on individual projects.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: **Met**
Mean score was 78%.

---

### 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

ACCT 4210
Devote more class time and assign more out-of-class assignments
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 4210: Structure and model business problems | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Lynn Hannan

ACCT 4310
Give students focused practice in identifying and representing business processes in unstructured situations, including strategies for assimilating information obtained from conversations. Develop a new internal control evaluation case at a level of complexity appropriate for undergraduate students.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 4310: Design business processes | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Measure: Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Faye Borthick

ACCT 4510
ChrisNotes (lecture notes) 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: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

ACCT4410
Adopt a few chapters from other textbooks, which provide better guidance for structured learning. Hold students more accountable for out-of-class learning.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Acct 4410: Perform financial statement analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Yen Lee

Curriculum Revision
ACCT 4110 is a four credit course and although all performance targets are being met, there are a number of important topics currently being skipped due to lack of time. As a result the students are not adequately prepared for the job market or the CPA exam. The one credit class ACCT 4030 also meets its performance targets but has been watered down considerably because it has been taught by PTIs. Given that financial statement analysis is also being offered at the graduate level the value of the UG level FSA class (ACCT4410) is not clear. Students might be better off with Advanced Accounting at the UG level or an accounting research class. A decision on this issue is still pending. We propose to revise the curriculum to replace the current ACCT4030 and ACCT4110 with two three credit classes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Acct 2101: Interpret financial transaction effects | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 2101: Perform basic accounting calculations | Outcome/Objective: Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 2101: Prepare financial statements | Outcome/Objective: Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4110: Develop accounting methods | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4110: Make decisions using financial info. | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4110: Prepare a financial reporting system | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4410: Access sources of financial information | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4410: Perform financial statement analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge
- Measure: Acct 4410: Read and interpret financial statements | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
  | Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan and Galen Sevcik

Principles of Accounting I and II
Devote more class time to in class activities to motivate students to attend class. Creation of 27 "Digital Tutors video mini lectures which will give focused guidance on the main skills in each chapter. Hiring peer tutors. Addition of graded in-class active learning activities.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Carol Springer

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We made considerable progress in reducing the D,W, F grades in ACCT2101 and 2102. We also significantly increased class attendance in ACCT2101 and 2102. We made considerable progress in meeting performance targets in ACCT4310.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
ACCT2101 and 2102 will need continued attention and resources. Considerable attention needs to be paid to curriculum revision, especially the financial accounting curriculum. Attention needs to be paid as to how to implement the Critical Thinking Through Writing initiative of the university.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Actuarial Science BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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: 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 (M: 1, 6)
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
Quantitative Skills--major
Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.4 External Relations
6.1 Recruitment

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course (O: 1, 2, 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 AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Program Director is generally satisfied with student performance in AS 4340. This course prepares BBA-AS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, and (3) performing valuation calculations using various tools including actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

Target for O2: Success on professional exams
The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Program Director is generally satisfied with student performance in AS 4340. This course prepares BBA-AS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, and (3) performing valuation calculations using various tools including actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Program Director is generally satisfied with student performance in AS 4340. This course prepares BBA-AS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, and (3) performing valuation calculations using various tools including actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Program Director is generally satisfied with student performance in AS 4340. This course prepares BBA-AS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, and (3) performing valuation calculations using various tools including actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

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. Graduating students will rate every knowledge/skill area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.32 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. While most areas were rated well above average, Computer Proficiency (Mean = 2.5), Written Communication (Mean = 2.92), Project Management (Mean = 2.93), Management of Technology (Mean = 2.86), and Entrepreneurship (Mean = 2.79) were rated below average. Appropriate course content will be considered for revision to address the lowest rated items. >>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. Graduating students will rate every knowledge/skill area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.32 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. While most areas were rated well above average, Computer Proficiency (Mean = 2.5), Written Communication (Mean = 2.92), Project Management (Mean = 2.93), Management of Technology (Mean = 2.86), and Entrepreneurship (Mean = 2.79) were rated below average. Appropriate course content will be considered for revision to address the lowest rated items. >>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, across multiple core business knowledge/skill areas. Graduating students will rate every knowledge/skill area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.32 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. While most areas were rated well above average, Computer Proficiency (Mean = 2.5), Written Communication (Mean = 2.92), Project Management (Mean = 2.93), Management of Technology (Mean = 2.86), and Entrepreneurship (Mean = 2.79) were rated below average. Appropriate course content will be considered for revision to address the lowest rated items. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### 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. Graduating students will rate every knowledge/skill area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.32 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. While most areas were rated well above average, Computer Proficiency (Mean = 2.5), Written Communication (Mean = 2.92), Project Management (Mean = 2.93), Management of Technology (Mean = 2.86), and Entrepreneurship (Mean = 2.79) were rated below average. Appropriate course content will be considered for revision to address the lowest rated items. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### 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 various core business knowledge/skill areas. Graduating students will rate every knowledge/skill area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

### 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. Graduating students will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.31 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. While the majority of areas were rated well above average, the area of Computer Proficiency was rated below average (i.e., mean = 2.5 on a 5-point scale). Changes in course content will be made to address the dissatisfaction with this item. >>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 areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Graduating students will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.31 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. While the majority of areas were rated well above average, the area of Computer Proficiency was rated below average (i.e., mean = 2.5 on a 5-point scale). Changes in course content will be made to address the dissatisfaction with this item. >>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, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Graduating students will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.31 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. While the large majority of areas were rated well above average, the area of Computer Proficiency was rated below average (i.e., mean = 2.5 on a 5-point scale). Changes in course content will be made to address the dissatisfaction with this item. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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. Graduating students will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students rated the AS Program above average overall (overall mean = 3.31 on a 5-point scale) in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. While the large majority of areas were rated well above average, the area of Computer Proficiency was rated below average (i.e., mean = 2.5 on a 5-point scale). Changes in course content will be made to address the dissatisfaction with this item. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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 higher. Graduating students will rate individual services 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services above average at all levels (college/university level mean = 3.24 and department level mean = 3.29, both on a 5-point scale) >>SURVEY RESULTS.

Target for O4: Relevance to employers
Graduating students will rate AS program services (at the department, college, and university levels) as above average or higher. Graduating students will rate individual services 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services above average at all levels (college/university level mean = 3.24 and department level mean = 3.29, both on a 5-point scale) >>SURVEY RESULTS.

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 higher. Graduating students will rate individual services 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services above average at all levels (college/university level mean = 3.24 and department level mean = 3.29, both on a 5-point scale) >>SURVEY RESULTS.

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 (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas. Alumni will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 4.21 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across various knowledge areas. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Target for O4: Relevance to employers
Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas. Alumni will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 4.21 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across various knowledge areas. >>>SURVEY RESULTS

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

Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across multiple knowledge areas. Alumni will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 4.21 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program contributed to career competence across various knowledge areas. >>>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 6: Alumni Survey - Professional Exams (O: 2, 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 O2: Success on professional exams**

Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 5.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams. >>>SURVEY RESULTS

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

Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 5.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams. >>>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 5.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams. >>>SURVEY RESULTS

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

Alumni will report satisfaction (3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied (mean = 5.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the actuarial science program helped them prepare for the actuarial professional exams. >>>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 that their respective firms would hire our graduates/students into full-time/internship positions.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

The industry panel failed to meet during the past academic year, but will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair in September 2007.

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

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

The industry panel failed to meet during the past academic year, but will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair in...
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 C, MLC, and MFE pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

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

Exam C, MLC, and MFE pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

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

Exam C, MLC, and MFE pass rates of Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

---

**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: Relevance to employers  
| Structure and solve problems  
**Implementation Description:** December 1, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lorilee Schneider

**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

**Convene biennial actuarial science industry panel**

An industry panel will be convened that includes representation from 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 2007. The Panel's 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:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

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

**Implementation Description:** September 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang

### Reporting of scores on national exams

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. We will again start reporting findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang

### Revision of AS 4350 Content

AS faculty will review and consider revising the content of AS 4350 to address graduating student dissatisfaction with the core business/AS related knowledge areas of (1) computer proficiency, (2) written communication, (3) project management, (4) management of technology, and (5) entrepreneurship.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **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 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang  
**Additional Resources:** The RMI Department will be hiring additional AS faculty for the upcoming academic year.

### Revisions to the BBA-AS curriculum

Review and consider revising the AS curriculum to (1) further strengthen written communication skills and the management of technology, (2) include more case studies, (3) require additional writing assignments, and (4) increase our offerings in risk modeling.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey - Career Competence  | **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  | Relevance to employers  | Structure and solve problems
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey - Professional Exams  | **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  | Relevance to employers  | Structure and solve problems  | Success on professional exams
- **Measure:** AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course  | **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory  | Structure and solve problems  | Success on professional exams
- **Measure:** Biennial Industry Panel  | **Outcome/Objective:** Relevance to employers  | Structure and solve problems
- **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 2008  
**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?**

Overall, the BBA-AS program has attracted an increased number of quality students, who are generally pleased with the department’s course offerings and services. The content of 4340 Life Contingencies was revised to include more Excel-based/computer-based assignments. The curriculum now includes added financial risk modeling components and we are looking to increase our offerings in this area. Students have demonstrated success in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding well-paying jobs upon graduation.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued**
The large number of majors we now have in the BBA-AS program may create some resource issues. Perhaps we need to be more selective when accepting AS majors. There remains a need to further strengthen written communication skills and the management of technology across the BBA-AS curriculum. AS 4340 may need to be further revised to include more case studies and require additional writing assignments and oral presentations. We are also looking to increase our offerings in risk modeling. We would like to continue to work with the Robinson College’s Career Services personnel and with our industry contacts to further increase student placement and internship opportunities. The Biennial Industry Panel responsible for assessing the actuarial science program’s contributions to actuarial education, failed to meet during the current assessment period. The panel will be convened during the Fall 2007 semester.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Actuarial Science MAS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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, 12)
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.

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
6.1 Recruitment

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
The industry panel failed to meet during the past academic year, but will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair in September 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
The industry panel failed to meet during the past academic year, but will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair in September 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
The industry panel failed to meet during the past academic year, but will meet in conjunction with the RCB/RMI Career Fair in September 2007.

# 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 have contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.1) with the extent to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. All courses were rated above average. >>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 have contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.1) with the extent to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. All courses were rated above average. >>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 have contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.1) with the extent to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. All courses were rated above average. >>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 MAS students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.25) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>SURVEY RESULTS

## Target for O5: Structure and solve problems

Graduating MAS students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.25) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>SURVEY RESULTS

## Target for O6: Relevance to employers

Graduating MAS students will report a high level of satisfaction (an average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.25) with their overall career preparation and the 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 MAS students will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.69 on a 5-point scale) across every program attribute surveyed. >SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.69 on a 5-point scale) across every program attribute surveyed. >SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.69 on a 5-point scale) across every program attribute surveyed. >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 MAS students will rate several potential changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The 2 or 3 top-rated changes will be considered by department personnel for implementation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) activities for alumni. >SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) activities for alumni. >SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The highest rated suggested program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) 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 alumni's competency in actuarial science.

**Target for O4: Explanation of technical concepts**
Alumni will be highly satisfied (average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. >SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Alumni will be highly satisfied (average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency.
# Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. >>SURVEY RESULTS

## Target for O6: Relevance to employers
Alumni will be highly satisfied (average score of 4.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have 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 alumni's overall career preparation.

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

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.0 on a 5-point scale) with their overall career preparation and the enhancement of career opportunities 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
MAS alumni will report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.70 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.70 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.70 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average. >>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**
MAS alumni will rate several suggested changes to the program on a 5-point scale. The top-rated 2 or 3 changes will be considered by department personnel for implementation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional 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 C, MLC, and MFE pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

**Target for O2: Success on professional exams**
Exam C, MLC, and MFE pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

**Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials**
Exam C, MLC, and MFE pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period.

**Target for O5: Structure and solve problems**
Exam C, MLC, and MFE pass rates for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
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. We will report findings for this measure during next year’s assessment 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 AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director is very satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar. MAS students were introduced to important topics in different areas of actuarial practice including life insurance, health insurance, pension, and property-casualty insurance. Furthermore, students were assigned team projects (26 students, in 9 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., reverse mortgage evaluation, mortality improvement, international trends, P&C loss reserving, pension funding liability, asset-liability management, etc). Students were able to apply the concepts and tools that they learned from other courses. Each student was given an opportunity to present his/her project work to the class. This has helped to improve students’ communication skills.

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

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director is very satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar. MAS students were introduced to important topics in different areas of actuarial practice including life insurance, health insurance, pension, and property-casualty insurance. Furthermore, students were assigned team projects (26 students, in 9 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., reverse mortgage evaluation, mortality improvement, international trends, P&C loss reserving, pension funding liability, asset-liability management, etc). Students were able to apply the concepts and tools that they learned from other courses. Each student was given an opportunity to present his/her project work to the class. This has helped to improve students’ communication skills.

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

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director is very satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar. MAS students were introduced to important topics in different areas of actuarial practice including life insurance, health insurance, pension, and property-casualty insurance. Furthermore, students were assigned team projects (26 students, in 9 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., reverse mortgage evaluation, mortality improvement, international trends, P&C loss reserving, pension funding liability, asset-liability management, etc). Students were able to apply the concepts and tools that they learned from other courses. Each student was given an opportunity to present his/her project work to the class. This has helped to improve students’ communication skills.

**M 12: AS 8340 Life Contingencies Course (O: 1, 2, 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 AS 8340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director is satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course. This course prepares MAS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, (3) performing valuation calculations using actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

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

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director is satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course. This course prepares MAS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, (3) performing valuation calculations using actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

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

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The Program Director is satisfied with student performance on assignments and exams in the AS 8340 Life Contingencies course. This course prepares MAS students for (1) taking Society of Actuaries Exam M, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, (3) performing valuation calculations using actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

### 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
  - 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
  - Graduate 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

#### Convene actuarial science biennial industry panel
An industry panel will be created that includes representation from 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 2007. The Panel's 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:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
  - Structure and solve problems
- **Implementation Description:** September 2007
Reporting of scores on professional exams
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. We will again start reporting findings for this measure during next year’s assessment period, using data from the prior year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Scores on Professional Exams | Outcome/Objective: Success on professional exams

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Suggested program changes
Survey results revealed that alumni and graduating students would like to see additional emphasis on job placement and increased activities for alumni. The AS Program Director will work with the Department’s Director of Student and External Affairs to address these needs.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

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: 2007-2008 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall, the MAS program has attracted an increased number of top students, who are generally pleased with the department's course offerings and services. Last year, MAS students had the highest average GMAT scores of any department in the Robinson College at 653. The content of AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar was revised to include additional writing assignments, team presentation projects, and expanded coverage of international topics. The department has substantially increased its support of and guidance to the Actuarial Student Association. The department's Director of Student and External Affairs has increased her direct involvement with the AS Job Fair and graduate student placement. AS 8340 Life Contingencies was revised to include more Excel-based/computer-based applications and assignments. Students have demonstrated success in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding well-paying jobs upon graduation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We have a large number of international MAS students who need additional help with their communication skills. There remains a need to further strengthen written and oral communication skills, overall, across the MAS curriculum. Requiring additional presentations and writing projects in all graduate level courses may help address the issue. The department's Director of Student and External Affairs must continue to work closely with the faculty and staff to develop attractive alumni activities that will enliven this important constituency. The Biennial Industry Panel responsible for assessing the actuarial science program's contributions to actuarial education, failed to meet during the current assessment period. The panel will be convened during the Fall 2007 semester. We would like to continue to work closely with the Robinson College's Career Services personnel and with our industry contacts to further increase student placement and internship opportunities.
**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: 2, 4)**

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.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Collecting Data (O: 3)**


**Target for O3: Analytical Skills**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The final research papers in AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories and AAS 4980 Senior Seminar were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine the mastery of skills to collect data. Members of the assessment committee examined the final research paper in AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories (N=10) and AAS 4980 Senior Seminar (N=27) by employing a five-item scale: 5=excellent; 4=very good; 3=good; 2=fair; 1=poor. The findings indicated that 88.8% (N=27) of the papers were rated good or better. In AAS 3975 80% (N=10) of the papers were rated good or better. In AAS 4980 94.1% (N=17) were rated good or better. The mean score was 3.62 for AAS 3975 which indicates that the average paper received a rating of good. The mean score was 4.2 for AAS 4980 (N=17) which indicates that the average paper received a rating of very good.

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

A rating of excellent (5): Papers reflects the identification, critique and synthesis of literature from three or more disciplines. A rating of very good (4): Paper reflects the identification, critique and synthesis of literature from at least two disciplines. A rating of good (3): Papers reflects the identification and critique of at least two disciplines but fails to synthesis the literature. A rating of fair (2): Paper reflect the identification of atleast two disciplines but fails to critique and synthesis the literature. A rating of poor (1): 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The final research papers in AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories and AAS 4980 Senior Seminar were examined by a three
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

AAS 4980 Senior Seminar-WAC Designation

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.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Committee
Additional Resources: None needed

Increase Interdisciplinary Assign in AAS coursework
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
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Committee
Additional Resources: None needed

AAS 4980 Senior Seminar-WAC Designation
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. In addition the faculty will increae writing assignments in AAS elective coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Committee
Additional Resources: None needed

Increase Interdisciplinary Assign in AAS coursework
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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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 with respect to "collecting data." As was the case for the 2005-2006 academic year, we again met the target performance level in which 88.8% (N=27) of the papers were rated good or better. Moreover, the mean average was 3.91. We attribute this success to the department’s two course research sequence. There is still room for improvement on the interdisciplinary measure in which 74.0% (N=27) of the papers were rated good. This figure is below the 80% target level. However, the mean average on the interdisciplinary measure (3.4) did meet the target level of 3.0. Similarly, the findings indicate that the AAS majors have also sufficiently mastered the Acquisition of Knowledge learning outcome. Nearly ninety per cent (88.8) of the 27 papers were rated good or better. This finding also indicates that action of increasing data application assignments proved beneficial. The mean average of the Acquisition of Knowledge measure was 3.75. While the mean average of the communication skills measure (3.8) met the target performance level of 3.0 the data on this measure 77.7% was again slightly below (2.3 percentage points) the 80% target performance level.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The data show that we met both target performance levels on the collecting data measure of the Analytical skills objective as well as the application of data measure of the Acquisition of Knowledge objective. The data also indicate that our targets were partially met for the communication skills learning outcome and the Acquisition of Knowledge learning outcome (interdisciplinary measure). In both instances the data were slightly below the 80% target performance level. To ensure that the student’s performance satisfy the target levels of these two learning outcomes the following actions will be undertaken: 1) increase writing assignments in AAS elective coursework; and 2) increase interdisciplinary assignments in AAS coursework.
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, primate 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 1: Cluster 1: Analytical Skills (M: 2)

The first cluster, analytical skills, contains seven learning objectives, including: (1) using theory in research design; (2) identify major themes in the literature; (3) designing and implementing research; (4) interpreting charts and diagrams; (5) representing ideas using symbolic notation; (6) translating the symbolic notation of others; (7) utilizing information technology for 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

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 3)

Cluster 2 is a composite of skills related to critical thinking, and includes (1) interpreting causal relationships; (2) critiquing the literature; (3) using critical thinking skills to form opinions; (4) mastering self-reflectivity; (5) understanding cultural relativism. The last two outcomes (4 and 5) are specific to anthropological inquiry. These and other critical thinking skills are featured in all of the five courses required of majors.

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
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Cluster 3: Communication Skills (M: 4)

Students demonstrate a variety of communication skills in the major, although most of the courses examined for the learning outcomes tended to emphasize written communication skills. The cluster of objectives examined here comprises four communication outcomes including (1) expressing ideas in writing; (2) expressing ideas orally; (3) collaborating on projects; (4) developing visual materials.
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
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 5)
The focus of this cluster is demonstrating the acquisition of fundamental anthropological knowledge, and includes (1) understanding the basis of social inequality; (2) mastering key concepts in anthropology; (3) identifying new insights and relationships.

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
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge (M: 6)
Anthropology offers students training in a variety of subdisciplines that can later be applied to the private and public sectors. This cluster includes (1) demonstrating basic archaeological, biological and cultural theories and methods; (2) applying anthropology to the real world using hypothetical and empirically-driven situations.

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
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Assessment of Critical Thinking in Anth 1102
Three indicators of performance were devised to assess how well students obtain critical thinking skills in Anth 1102 (Introduction to Anthropology). These include (1) understanding and applying the scientific method; (2) the biocultural evolution of humans; and (3) critiquing the race concept.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Written Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
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

O/O 7: 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: Assessment of Critical Thinking in a Core Course (O: 7)**

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.

**Target for O7: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

(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 essay. (3) At least three-fourths of the students are expected to pass this assignment with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The findings for the Fall 2006 assessment of critical thinking in Anth 1102 are as follows: (1) Slightly less than a quarter of the students answered at least four out of the five questions correctly. (2) The average score for the forty-six students was 65% and only 39% of the students earned above 80%. (3) A full 95% of the students obtained a grade of C while only two students earned below a C on this assignment.

**M 2: Cluster 1: Analytical Skills (O: 1)**

The faculty used various measures to estimate the degree to which students mastered the learning outcomes related to analytical skills. These included the final paper and exams (Anth 2010), tests, essays, pop-quizzes, papers, projects and assignments (Anth 2020), essays and tests (Anth 2030), final paper, exams, presentations (Anth 4020) and final projects and essays (Anth 4970). The faculty were asked to rank the students on a four point ranking system (excellent, good, fair and poor). Six faculty members were asked to rank students in five courses; two of the courses had two evaluators (and were averaged) and one faculty member evaluated two courses.

**Target for O1: Cluster 1: Analytical Skills**

It was anticipated that students would rank as excellent or good on the learning outcomes associated with analytical skills.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Faculty rankings ranged from 1.0 to 1.5 for the analytical skills cluster. Students performed extremely well in designing and implementing research and received somewhat scores for identifying major themes in the literature and utilizing information technology for research. These patterns are similar to those obtained from the the 2007 assessment of learning outcomes. The detailed faculty ratings for all measures are on the linked table.

**M 3: Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills (O: 2)**

Critical thinking was evaluated on the basis of five criteria. Three of these learning outcomes are general while two are specifically related to anthropology (self-reflectivity and cultural relativism). The faculty evaluated the students using tests and quizzes (Anth 2010), class papers, tests, discussion and assignments (Anth 2020), tests and take-home essays (Anth 2030), class presentations, final projects, exams and papers (Anth 4020) and essays and tests (Anth 4970). Six faculty members were asked to rank students in five courses; two of the courses had two evaluators (and were averaged) and one faculty member evaluated two courses.

**Target for O2: Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills**

The students were expected to be ranked as excellent or good in critical thinking skills.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The faculty evaluators ranked the students between 1.1 to 1.65 (1 is excellent, 2 is good) in critical thinking skills. Four of five of the outcomes were close to 1.1 and therefore satisfy the a prior expectations. Critiquing the literature (#9) exhibits the weakest of the five outcomes and but was still met by the students. The detailed faculty ratings for all measures are on the linked table.

**M 4: Cluster 3: Communication Skills (O: 3)**

The faculty rely heavily on writing to evaluate students generally. The other communication skills listed in Cluster 3 are applicable only for some of the courses required of majors. Students were assessed for this cluster using the final paper (Anth 2010), papers, quizzes, short answer/essays, group work, discussion questions and oral presentations (Anth 2020), take home essays and short answers on exams (Anth 2030), in class and take home exams, weekly discussions, presentations, papers and WebCT discussions (Anth 4020) and final projects, presentations and papers (Anth 4970). Six faculty members were asked to rank students in five courses; two of the courses had two evaluators (and were averaged) and one faculty member evaluated two courses.

**Target for O3: Cluster 3: Communication Skills**

The students were expected to be ranked as excellent or good on their communication skills.
The faculty evaluated the acquisition of anthropological knowledge using tests, quizzes and lab assignments (Anth 2010), exams, quizzes and projects (Anth 2030), midterm and final exams (Anth 4020) and papers and exams (Anth 4970). Six faculty members were asked to rank students in five courses; two of the courses had two evaluators (and were averaged) and one faculty member evaluated two courses.

**Target for O4: Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge**

Considering the efficacy of this cluster to capture a measure of overall course performance, the students were expected to be ranked as excellent in acquisition of knowledge.

The rankings for this cluster were higher than those for the other clusters and ranged from 1 to 1.1 (1 = excellent, 2 = good). The students successfully mastered the learning outcomes associated with the acquisition of anthropological knowledge. The detailed faculty ratings for all measures are on the linked table.

**M 6: Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge (O: 5)**

Application of knowledge was assessed using laboratory assignments (Anth 2010), participant observation assignment, exams, short answers, in-class discussions and the final exam (Anth 2020), tests, class discussion and final projects (Anth 4020) and final projects and class discussions (Anth 4790). Six faculty members were asked to rank students in five courses; two of the courses had two evaluators (and were averaged) and one faculty member evaluated two courses.

**Target for O5: Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge**

The students were expected to perform excellent or good in the outcomes linked with the application of knowledge.

The rankings for this cluster ranged from 1.1 to 1.3 (1 = excellent, 2 = good). The students performed somewhat better than expected in the two learning outcomes comprising this cluster: training in basic methods and application of knowledge to real world situations. The detailed faculty ratings for all measures are on the linked table.

**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>Establishes in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>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>Establishes in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Frank Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Discussions of Outcomes**

The faculty of the Department of Anthropology plan to discuss revising the curriculum next fall in light of the specializations of new departmental hires, and the learning outcomes will play an obvious role in decisions regarding changes. The rubric of assessment will also be discussed, and specific strategies for improving writing skills, critiquing the literature, using theory in research design and other outcomes will be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Measure: | Cluster 1: Analytical Skills |
| Outcome/Objective: | Cluster 1: Analytical Skills |
Outcomes/Objectives

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Anthropology offers a Master of Arts in Anthropology. Graduate education in anthropology emphasizes 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

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

6.3 Graduate Experience

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

This year the department broadened the scope of the learning outcomes from 2005-2006 by adding three more courses--required of all majors--to the assessment. The total of five courses being evaluated provided the vast majority of departmental faculty members the opportunity to assess the learning outcomes of the students. These additional data strengthened the approach from last year by improving the dimensionality of the assessment. Not all learning outcomes were assessed in every course, but every outcome was assessed in at least a single course. Assessment of five rather than two courses revealed that the deficiency of student achievement in using symbols last year was actually a sampling issue in course selection. Specifically, the use of symbolic notation was not ranked last year because only Anthropological Theory and Senior Seminar were evaluated. The 2006-2007 assessment showed that all majors in the program are asked to master translating the symbolic notation of others (#6) and representing concepts using symbols (#5) through kinship exercises required in Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. The students were ranked close to excellent (1.2 to 1.5) by two faculty members, and successfully satisfied the expectations of the assessment. With respect to the other outcomes assessed, the majors generally met or exceeded the targets established beforehand.

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

Although the three lowest ranked learning outcomes still met the expectations of the evaluation, there is still room for improvement. These three objectives are writing skills (#13), critiquing the literature (#9) and using theory in research design (#1). Writing skills was the lowest ranked outcome and will be given attention in Anthropological Theory and Senior Seminar which are the two writing intensive courses of the major that correspond to the Critical Thinking through Writing initiative for the Quality Enhancement Program of the College of Arts and Sciences. The faculty are confident that the teaching of writing skills will be improved, and will work on an individual basis to improve student attainment of critiquing the literature and using theory in research design. An additional learning outcome, critical thinking in a core anthropology course, was examined in Fall 2006 using a heuristic rubric that only partially met the target values established a priori. One probable reason for the partial failure of students to meet the expectations is that the tool was too broad to capture the essence of the outcome. A new assessment is currently being constructed to better represent critical thinking in the core.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Anthropology MA
(A s of 12/12/2016 03:03 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 emphasizes 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. The three questions include (1) the field of inquiry, (2) theory pertaining to the research, and (3) method to be employed in the research. The graduate students are asked to write 7-10 pages for each question, and to return the completed exam to each committee member within two weeks. The exam is then evaluated; the advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the exam as a pass, contingent pass or fail. The Anthropology Graduate Program Director was consulted to obtain data on the number students who took the comprehensive exam. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who took the comprehensive exam, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the exam on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the exam, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the comprehensive exam.

Target for O1: Assessment of learning outcomes for MA students

Eighty to ninety percent of the students were expected to pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Eleven students passed the comprehensive exam. Four of these students delayed taking their comprehensive exam until their fourth semester, and then graduated in their fifth semester, taking a bit longer than the ideal 2 years to complete the program. One student who graduated was a part-time student who took 5 years to complete the MA. All of the students who took the comprehensive exam passed on the first attempt.

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

Faculty rating of outcomes from 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.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: October 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of Department of Anthropology

Improving Assessment of Graduate Students

The comprehensive exam is an important tool to evaluate potential MA graduates. Last year we attempted to change the timing of the exam to earlier in the third semester, and this may have helped to motivate students to successfully pass. The faculty agree that no change to the assessment is needed at this time, but will discuss the MA learning outcomes at the next faculty meeting.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessing Outcomes using the Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Assessment of learning outcomes for MA students

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate faculty of the Department of Anthropology

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The comprehensive exam required of all graduate students is an integral component of the MA degree. Eleven students satisfied the requirements of their graduate committees, exceeding the expectations established beforehand.

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

Faculty encouragement to take the exam on time, could improve the rate of students that successfully obtain their MA within two years. The faculty advisors will individually monitor the progress of their students to ensure that they are progressing and graduating at a satisfactory pace.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Applied Linguistics BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 is committed to excellence in the preparation of
second/foreign language teachers, in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, and in other applications of applied linguistics theory to the solution of real world problems. This goal is achieved by providing instruction, support, and inspiration to those interested in applied linguistics in general and in the teaching of English as a second or foreign language in particular. The department's instructional programs and research activities are designed for current and prospective language teachers, language learners, curriculum designers, materials developers, program administrators, teacher educators, and researchers in the field. All units housed within the department support this focus. Reflecting the goals of the wider university, the department seeks to provide a range of activities which prepare students to think critically, make ethical and informed choices, appreciate diverse cultures and ideas, become creative problem-solvers, and demonstrate responsible citizenship.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: New program**  
This is a new degree program which has just begun admitting students.

**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: New Program (O: 2)**  
This is a new degree program which has just begun admitting students.

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**  
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 2006-2007 - Target:**  
This is a new degree program which has just begun admitting students.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**  
This is a new degree program which has just begun admitting students.
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: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English (M: 7, 8)**
Demonstrates knowledge of the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 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
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

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

**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
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 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**

1.1 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
3.2 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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
25 students completed their master’s papers in this academic year. 23/25 papers (92%) were rated "excellent" or "good" in the areas of connecting theory to practice and scholarship, 23/25 (92%) were rated "excellent or "good" in writing, and 24/25 (96%) were rated "excellent" or "good" in formatting/referencing.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
25 students completed their master’s papers in this academic year. 23/25 papers (92%) were rated "excellent" or "good" in the areas of connecting theory to practice and scholarship, 23/25 (92%) were rated "excellent or "good" in writing, and 24/25 (96%) were rated "excellent" or "good" in formatting/referencing.

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of graduating students completed their CBE requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Connecting theory and practice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students completed their CBE requirement.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3: Professional development activities (O: 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O7: Professional development**

100% of students will complete this requirement.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students completed the professional development requirement.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 4: Number of presentations/publications (O: 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisors count the number of conference presentations and/or publications for each student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O7: Professional development**

50% of students will make at least one conference presentation or written at least one published article.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

10 out of 25 graduating students (40%) made at least one conference presentation.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5: Oral presentation of Master’s paper (O: 5, 6)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O5: Communication**

90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on their presentations.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

17 students made oral presentations of their Master’s papers. 100% of students were rated "good" or excellent" on their presentations.

**Target for **O6: Technology**

90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on their presentations.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

17 students made oral presentations of their Master’s papers. 100% of students were rated "good" or excellent" on their presentations.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 6: Teaching performance and videotapes (O: 1, 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O1: Teaching methodology**

90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

28 students took the practicum course during this academic year. 26 of 28 (93%) met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

**Target for **O5: Communication**

90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

28 students took the practicum course during this academic year. 26 of 28 (93%) met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Survey of graduating students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

22 recent graduates completed the survey (up from 13 last year). The percentage of students rating each outcome 4 or 5 was as follows (the previous two year’s percentages (2005/6, 2004/5) are included in parentheses for comparison): Outcome 1: 95% (100%, 94%) Outcome 2: 77% (100%, 83%) Outcome 3: 95% (100%, 83%) Outcome 4: 91% (85%, 89%) Outcome 5: 96% (84%, 100%) Outcome 6: 82% (61%, 77%) Outcome 7: 82% (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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All syllabi for required courses except two contained appropriate learning outcomes.

**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, Connecting theory and practice, Professional development, Technology*

*Implementation Description: March 2007*
*Responsible Person/Group: Sara Weigle*

**Instruction in linguistics**
A faculty committee will be formed to review the curriculum for two required courses (General Linguistics and Grammar), particularly in light of the impending retirement of a faculty member who teaches the grammar course regularly. The committee will make recommendations to the full faculty for their approval by the end of Fall Semester, 2007.

*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: Medium*

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*
  - *Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English*

*Implementation Description: December 1, 2007*
*Responsible Person/Group: Gayle Nelson*

**professional development**
At our faculty retreat in August, we will discuss strategies to encourage more students to present at conferences. Relevant strategies may include (a) improving advisement procedures; (b) providing more mentoring support to students in the form of abstract writing workshops, etc.; (c) providing financial support to students to present at conferences.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Number of presentations/publications | Outcome/Objective: Professional development  

Implementation Description: August 25, 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Gayle Nelson

**syllabi**

The chair or her designee will remind all faculty every semester to include appropriate learning outcomes statements in their syllabi.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Syllabi | Outcome/Objective: Communication | Connecting theory and practice | Cultural knowledge | Knowledge of linguistic systems of English | Teaching methodology | Technology  

Implementation Description: August 15, 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Gayle Nelson

**Technology in teaching**

Strategies for integrating technology into courses will be discussed at the departmental retreat in August. These strategies may include (a) adding a technology course to the curriculum; we have been offering such a course as a Special Topics for two years but it has not been officially submitted to the college Curriculum Committee; (b) inviting speakers from various units on campus to make presentations on the available technological resources on campus; (c) designating a faculty member to serve as a resource to assist other faculty members in enhancing their courses through technology; (d) having informal faculty development sessions on using technology as a teaching and learning tool.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Technology  

Implementation Description: August 25, 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Gayle Nelson

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

We now have data on student perceptions of the program from the past three years. The number of respondents each year has been somewhat small so that it is difficult to generalize from one year’s data, but over three years students’ responses to questions regarding teaching methods, intercultural communication, and oral and written communication indicate that these areas are definite strengths of the program. Virtually all students are performing at or above expectations on their written master’s papers and oral presentations based on those papers, as well as on their videotaped teaching sample.

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

The student survey continues to indicate that students want more instruction in technology. While the percentage of students who express confidence in their ability to use technology effectively in teaching and learning has risen over the past three years, we need to continue improving in this area. In addition, the professional development component of the program needs to be scrutinized. It may be that the current system for documenting professional development activities (two reflective essays per semester) needs to be modified or strengthened to increase students’ awareness of the importance of on-going professional development in our field.
## 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

**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
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 3: Teaching experience (M: 3)
Graduates will be experienced teachers.

**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
3.2 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**
1.1 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
3.2 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
1.1 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
3.2 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.

Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics
90% of students will pass the qualifying paper requirement.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
In the current academic year, 3 students wrote qualifying papers and all 3 passed (100%).

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.

Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics
90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
In this academic year 3 students took their comprehensive examinations and all 3 passed (100%).

Target for O2: Research methodology
90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
In this academic year 3 students took their comprehensive examinations and all 3 passed (100%).

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.
### Target for O3: Teaching experience

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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As yet there are no graduates of our Ph.D. program. However, of the four students who are currently writing their dissertations, all four (100%) have taught for at least four semesters, including at least two undergraduate courses.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As yet there are no graduates of our Ph.D. program. However, of the four students who are currently writing their dissertations, all four (100%) have taught for at least four semesters, including at least two undergraduate courses.

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

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

### Target for O1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics

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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

8 of 11 Ph.D. students in their second year or beyond presented at conferences and/or published papers during this academic year, with a combined total of 16 conference presentations/publications.

### Target for O2: Research methodology

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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

8 of 11 Ph.D. students in their second year or beyond presented at conferences and/or published papers during this academic year, with a combined total of 16 conference presentations/publications.

### Target for O5: Professional development

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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

8 of 11 Ph.D. students in their second year or beyond presented at conferences and/or published papers during this academic year, with a combined total of 16 conference presentations/publications.

## 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

### Teacher mentoring

A faculty committee will work with the IEP Director, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and other relevant people to survey the opportunities that are currently available to Ph.D. students for mentoring MA-level teachers(e.g., teaching the Practicum course) and make recommendations for increasing these opportunities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  Measure: Teaching experience | Outcome/Objective: Teacher mentoring  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Gayle Nelson

## Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Our assessments have demonstrated that our Ph.D. students are making satisfactory progress towards their degrees and that those who are nearing the end of their Ph.D. program are positioning themselves well for academic positions, with regular conference presentations and substantial teaching at the undergraduate level.

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

All of our targets for our Ph.D. students were met this year; however, we have not yet graduated any Ph.D. students from the program. We will be adding new outcomes and objectives over the coming years specifically related to how our students fare in the job market and in their early career years as an additional way of assessing the success of the Ph.D. program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Art Education BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
11 Quantitative Skills--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 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>

### 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>

### 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>
<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>1.1 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>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Written Communication - Senior Level (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four essays submitted explaining four portfolio pieces from four different aesthetic viewpoints including composition, technical skills and craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</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>8 Critical Thinking--core</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>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>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Praxis I Score (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</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>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>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A transcript is submitted establishing a minimum GPA of 2.5 overall and 3.0 in art classes is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</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>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>10 Contemporary Issues--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quantitative Skills--core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Technology--core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

### 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 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the major. Students not accepted into the major have the option to reapply or pursue another BFA degree or the AB in Studio Art degree. Of the 31 students evaluated 84% achieved the minimum target score of 3. 84% of the students earned the target score goal of 4.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
84% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 3 and 84% achieved the target score goal of 4. 39% scored 6, 19% scored 5, 26% scored 4, 0% scored 3, 10% scored 2, 3% scored 1, and 3% scored 0.

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

**Target for O4: Content Knolwedge - Sophomore Level**
Scoring from 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the 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 31 students evaluated, 94% received the target score goal of 4 and 98% received the minimum score goal of 3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
98% of the students earned the minimum score goal of 3 and 94% earned the target score goal of 4. 27% earned a score of 6, 45% earned a score of 5, 45% earned a score of 4, 4% earned a score of 3, 15% earned a score of 2, 0% earned a score of 1, and .5% earned a score of 0.

**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 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the 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 31 students evaluated, 81% earned the minimum score goal of 3 and 69% earned the target score goal of 4.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
81% earned the minimum score goal of 3 and 69% earned the target score goal of 4. 20% earned the score of 6, 32% earned the score of 5, 12% earned the score of 4, 19% earned the score of 3, 19% earned the score of 2, 0% earned the score of 1, 0% earned the score of 0.

**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 0-6. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. Out of the 31 students evaluated 100% achieved the minimum overall GPA requirement of 2.5 and 3.0 in art courses. The average overall GPA was 3.3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Out of the 31 students evaluated 100% achieved the minimum overall GPA requirement of 2.5 and 3.0 in art courses. The average overall GPA was 3.3.

**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. All students who complete the BFA program passed Praxis I.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students who completed the BFA program passed the Praxis I. The actual scores are not available at this time.

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 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the 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 31 students evaluated, 96% earned the minimum score of 3 and 95% earned the target score of 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

96% of the students earned the minimum score goal of 3 and 95% earned the target score goal of 4. 75% earned 6, 10% earned 5, 10% earned 4, 1.5% earned 3, 2.5% earned 2, .5% earned 1 and .5% earned 0.

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 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major. It is expected that not all sophomores will be admitted to the 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 31 students evaluated, 98% achieved the minimum score goal of 3 and 94% achieved the target score goal of 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

98% of the students earned the minimum score goal of 3 and 94% earned the target score goal of 4. 27% earned a score of 6, 22% earned a score of 5, 45% earned a score of 4, 4% earned a score of 3, 1.5% earned a score of 2, 0% earned a score of 1, and .5% earned a score of 0.

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 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4. Out of the 26 students evaluated, 96% earned a score of 4 and 88% earned a score of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The minimum score goal is 4. Out of the 26 students evaluated, 96% earned a score of 4 and 88% earned a score of 5.

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

Based on faculty observation.

Target for O7: Professional Competencies - Senior Level

Scoring from 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4. Out of the 26 students evaluated, 96% achieved the minimum score of 4 and 88% achieved the target goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

90% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 88% achieved the target score goal of 5. 57% achieved the score of 6, 31% achieved the score of 5, 8% achieved the score of 4 and 4% achieved the score of 3.

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 1 - 6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4. Out of the 26 students evaluated, 96% achieved the minimum score of 4 and 84% achieved the target score goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

96% achieved the minimum score of 4 and 84% achieved the target score of 5. 38% earned a score of 6, 46% earned a score of 5, 12% earned a score of 4, 4% earned a score of 3.

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 1 -6. Out of the 26 students evaluated, 95% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 78% achieved the target score goal of 5.
Increase professional participation

M 12: Written Communication - Senior Level (O: 12)

Four written essays submitted on four different artworks in portfolio.

Target for M 12: Written Communication - Senior Level

Scoring from 1-6. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4. Out of the 26 students evaluated 95% met the minimum score goal of 4 and 67% met the target score goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

While 90% of the students met the minimum score goal of 4, 67% met the target score goal of 5. 29% achieved a score of 6, 38% achieved a score of 5, 28% achieved a score of 4 and 5% achieved a score of 3.

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level</td>
<td>Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level</td>
<td>Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level</td>
<td>Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Written essays</td>
<td>Written Communication - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average - application to major</td>
<td>Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan - Senior Level</td>
<td>Instructional Planning - senior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan - Sophomore Level</td>
<td>Instructional Planning - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio - Sophomore Level</td>
<td>Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio and other course assignments</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis I scores</td>
<td>Praxis I Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Design and implement new technology course

A new technology course will be designed in the fall of 2007 for implementation in Fall 2008. The course will be modeled on the ART 3400: Digital Possibilities course in the BFA Studio Art Program. This new Art Education course will acquaint students with the software applications within the Adobe Suite and will stress utilizing these software programs as computer graphic tools for studio work.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level</td>
<td>Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Sophomore Level</td>
<td>Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Written Communication - Sophomore level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan - Senior Level</td>
<td>Instructional Planning - senior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis I scores</td>
<td>Praxis I Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Melody Millbrandt, Area Coordinator

Additional Resources: The computer labs available for classroom instructional use within the School have reached their capacity for scheduling. Therefore, it may be necessary to locate another computer lab or acquire new additional computer technology equipment to install in the art education program area in order to conduct this course.

Enhance critical thinking and writing activities

Critical thinking and critical writing will be enhanced in the four methods courses in an effort to raise the target scores in written communication and critical thinking skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan - Senior Level</td>
<td>Instructional Planning - senior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis I scores</td>
<td>Praxis I Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
<td>Professional Competencies - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
<td>Written Communication - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Melody Millbrandt, Area Coordinator

Increase professional participation
The faculty will encourage greater participation in the GSU Student Chapter of National Art Education Association through conference attendance. Involvement of this kind indirectly impacts every area of learning and provides a critical framework for positioning oneself as an art educator in the larger professional community.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Praxis I scores | Outcome/Objective: Professional Competencies - Senior Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Senior Level

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Millibrandt, Area Coordinator

**Utilize GACE assessment test**
GACE, the new certification test for Art Education, will be utilized as an additional assessment tool. Based on student performance, this test can point to additional areas that may need attention in the program curricula.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Portfolio - Senior Level
- Measure: Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Four Written essays | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Sophomore level
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning - senior level
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Lesson Planning - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Portfolio - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Portfolio and other course assignments | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Praxis I scores | Outcome/Objective: Praxis I Score

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Millibrandt, Area Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Students entering the program are meeting target goals in the areas of content knowledge and professional competency. Students at the Pre-Student Teaching level, who are evaluated with higher standards, are meeting the target goal for content knowledge and are close to achieving the target goal for professional competency. The assessment of these two areas indicate consistently high results from the entry level to the exit level.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Written communication received the lowest scores at both the entry level and exit level of the program. The new course ART 1050, to be begin at the Foundation level in Fall 2008, will address critical reading and writing. This course will impact the intellectual development of the BFA Art Education student at an early stage and should improve the written communication scores at both the entry and exit level. The lower scores related to technology will also be impacted by the new course to be developed by the art ed faculty for initiation in Fall 2008. This course will be modeled on ART 3400: Digital Possibilities, which is directed for studio art majors.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2006-2007 Art Education MAEd**

(Scrolls and tables are present, indicating data by section.)

**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)

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
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
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.

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.

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.

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

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 5: Partnerships with Learning Communities (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Thesis Paper - Part I (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Professional Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring 1-6. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students. Out of the 9 students who were evaluated 100% met the minimum score of 4. 100% met the target score of 5. The average score was 5.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the 9 students evaluated, 22% scored 5 and 78% scored 6. 100% met the minimum score goal of 4 and 100% met the target score of 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 1-6. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students. Out of the 9 students who were evaluated 100% met the minimum score of 4 and 78% met the target score of 5. The average score was 4.7. |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| 100% of the students met the minimum score goal of 4. 78% achieved the target score goal of 5. 22% scored 4. |

| **M 3: Interview and Observation (O: 3)** |
| An interview and observation is held to determine mentoring capabilities. |
| **Target for O3: Ability to mentor** |
| Scoring 1-6. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students. Out of the 9 students who were evaluated 88% met the minimum score of 4 and 77% met the target score of 5. The average score was 5. |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| 88% of the students met the minimum score goal of 4. 77% met the target score goal of 5. 11% scored 3, 11% scored 4, 44% scored 4, and 33% scored 6. |

| **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 1-6. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students. Out of the 9 students who were evaluated 100% met the minimum score of 4 and 78% met the target score of 5. The average score was 5.4. |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| 100% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 78% achieved the target score goal of 5. 22% scored 2, while 11% scored 5 and 67% scored 6. |

| **M 5: Interview (O: 5)** |
| Interview is held between faculty member and student. |
| **Target for O5: Partnerships with Learning Communities** |
| Scoring 1-6. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students. Out of the 9 students who were evaluated 89% met the minimum score of 4 and 78% met the target score of 5. The average score was 4.6. |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** }
89% of the student achieved the minimum score goal of 4, while 78% achieved the target score goal of 5. 11% scored 3 and 11% scored 4.

### 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: Partnership 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.

#### Enhancement of critical thinking/critical writing

Critical thinking and critical writing will be enhanced in the methodology courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Interview | Outcome/Objective: Partnership 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:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Millibrandt, Area Coordinator

#### Increase in professionalism

Students will be encouraged to increase their participation in the GSU Student Chapter of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) by regularly attending the conferences and by submitting and presenting their research at the conferences. Greater activity with online discussion groups will be encouraged to broaden their knowledge of national concerns in art education, to practice their critical thinking skills and to develop their expertise in critical writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Interview | Outcome/Objective: Partnership 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:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Millibrandt, Area Coordinator

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Students earned scores that exceeded the minimum score goal in every area and reached the target goal in one of the 5 outcomes/objectives. In the 4 other outcomes the scores are consistently high.

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

By increasing the demand for more critical thinking and writing in the methodology courses, faculty anticipate students performing stronger in the outcome/objective of systematic thinking and lecturing. Faculty also anticipate a positive impact on the outcome/objective of management/mentoring from this expectation. Increased participation in
### 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  
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>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<tr>
<td>4 Oral Communication--core</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>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<tr>
<td>9 Contemporary Issues--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>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Critical Thinking Skills in Core Courses (M: 8)**

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**

1.2 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**

6.1 Recruitment
6.2 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 9 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.2. Target level average score goal is 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 9 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 2006-2007 - Target: 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 9 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.4. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 9 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 2006-2007 - Target: 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 essay questions and a submitted writing project
Target for O5: Written Communication Skills
Scoring 1-5. Out of the 9 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.4. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 9 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.3. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 9 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.5. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, the area faculty members seek stronger performance.

M 8: Critical Thinking Skills in Core (O: 3, 8)
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.

Target for O8: Critical Thinking Skills in Core Courses
Students should score at least 75% on critical thinking assignments.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Art History faculty meet twice during the academic year 2006-07 to review the learning outcomes, and agreed that no edits or deletions were needed at this time. Based on last year’s action plan, the course under review was rotated to a different instructor and material was gathered from a mid-semester computer graded exam. Course: AH 1700 Enrollment: 84 The test contained 75 questions, 22 of which were identified as “critical thinking.” While several of the questions clearly aligned with specific critical thinking learning outcomes, the majority fulfilled two or more outcomes simultaneously. Range of scores on ct questions: 47% - 98% Median score on ct questions: 75% Data demonstrates that target level of 75% was achieved.

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: Exam in upper-level AH course | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Specialized Content
- Measure: Exam in 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 (eg. powerpoint presentations; study images online via Artstor database).

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Area faculty meeting/follow up
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to continue to improve overall performance of students. Faculty will determine the need to raise the minimum standard for next year in light of achieving minimum standards for two consecutive years.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

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
  Written Communication Skills
  Measure: Exam in upper-level AH course | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Specialized Content
  Language course sequence | Outcome/Objective: Competence in a Foreign Language
  Measure: Research based exam questions and writing project | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills

Improve critical thinking at the core
Rotate the critical thinking evaluation to a different instructor’s class. Target of 75% set for this year’s measure of performance was achieved. Target is to maintain 75% under the rotation to a new instructor who will use digital technology via PowerPoint presentations, online image postings and Artstor database.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Critical Thinking Skills in Core | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills in Core Courses

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 the minimum goals established by an average of 1.3 points on a 5 point system.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Since students met or exceeded the minimum goals established for two consecutive years, area faculty will consider raising the minimum goal by .5 for next year.
1. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Knowledge of Methods and Theories (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of methods and theories of art history based on exposure to substantive scholarship and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of analytical and critical thinking skills relevant to art historical ideas, issues and provenance and scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Research Skills (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to gather relevant art historical evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
3. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
1. Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
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>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness
2. Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
### 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. There were 0 students evaluated this year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
No students went through comprehensive exams this year.

#### 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. No students went through comprehensive exams this year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
No students went through comprehensive exams this year.

#### 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 4. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, 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 2 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, 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 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.4. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, 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 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4.5. The target score goal is 4.5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Although all students met the goal with above average scores, 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. There were 0 students evaluated this year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
No students were evaluated this year

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
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: 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 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 1, 4)</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 3: Formulate Research Questions (M: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop research questions appropriate for research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Data Collection (M: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Data Analysis (M: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

**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 electromagnetic 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.2 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 - 3.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.1 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.2 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 - 3.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.1 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.2 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 - 3.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.1 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 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.2 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 - 3.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.1 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O10: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 5.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O8: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O12: Specialized Equipment**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Specialized Equipment - 4.5 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.
Target for O3: Formulate Research Questions

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

Target for O4: Data Collection

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

Target for O5: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

Target for O6: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

Target for O8: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Three students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 15 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 - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

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

**Engage Faculty**

A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last two years of assessment of learning outcomes in the Astronomy Ph.D. program will be discussed. The faculty will receive copies of the assessment report and discuss the performance of the program for each outcome.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Dissertation</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Dissertation Presentation and Defense</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Qualifying Exam 2</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills and Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Research Advisor</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Skills</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** September 30, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Chairman Dick Miller and the Department Assessment Committee

**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 (2006/2007 academic year), 3 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. The Astronomy Ph.D. program shows strength across the board in the areas assessed. The learning outcomes which fell below target values in 2006/2007 were different from the areas which fell below target values in 2005/2006, indicating statistical variability due to low numbers of students. Particular strength was measured in areas related to computer and research equipment skills.

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

The areas of weakest performance were in Motivations and Implications of Research and Future Research, although these were still near target levels. These outcomes will receive particular attention at the planned faculty meeting.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 06-07, the BLD certification program had approximately 130 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

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**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

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**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

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**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

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**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

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### 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

### New Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### 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

### New Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### 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

### 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.

**Findings 2006-2007**
- **Target:** Partially Met
  - 20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

#### 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.

**Findings 2006-2007**
- **Target:** Partially Met
  - 20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

#### 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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. 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

20% (2 of N=5) of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

**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

**Review requirements**

Review student entry requirements, advancement through the program, and program requirements.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development regarding learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

- **Implementation Description:** June 2008
- **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?**

Some students accomplished work at or above expected levels.

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

These ratings were lower than expected for some students (3 of 5), but it should be noted the lower ratings were only on 3 students,
all of whom have had some problems in the program—either being out of sequence in coursework and practicum, failing previous coursework, missing class meetings, and/or poor practicum evaluations.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 06-07, the BLD Master's program had approximately 60 students in the program, with 21 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.
Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

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.
Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

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.
Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

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.
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.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of BLD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of BLD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of BLD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of BLD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of BLD 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

**Continue to monitor progress**  
Continue monitoring progress in master’s program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Implementation Description:** June 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Houchins and BLD program

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Indicators continue to be positive in all areas. Students continue to meet program learning outcomes.

---

**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, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25)**

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: 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25)**

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: 6, 7, 9)**

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: 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22)**

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 (M: 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25)**

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, 5)**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One hundred thirteen students representing a cross-section of introductory courses (Biol 1103K, 1104K, 2107K, and 2108K) were screened. Of these, 78% (88/113) received a score equal to or exceeding 66.7%.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**

At least 75% of students must receive a score of 66.7% on the examination.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One hundred thirteen students representing a cross-section of introductory courses (Biol 1103K, 1104K, 2107K, and 2108K) were screened. Of these, 78% (88/113) received a score equal to or exceeding 66.7%.

**M 2: Interpretation of Graphical Information (O: 1)**

Students in Biol 3810 will interpret a graph on enzyme kinetics.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

80% (4.0/5.0) receive scores of 70% (3.5/5.0) or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

80% of students receive 70% (3.5/5.0) or higher. The median score was 4.6/5.0.

**M 3: 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**

80% of students should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

89% scored 70% (3.5/5.0) or above. The median score was 88% (4.4/5.0)

**M 4: Conduct investigations (O: 1, 2, 4)**

Students in Biol 3810 and 3250 develop approaches to answering biological questions.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**

75% of students should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of students develop a plausible approach to the separation (as measured by scores on written summaries).

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
75% of students should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of students develop a plausible approach to the separation (as measured by scores on written summaries).

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
75% of students should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of students develop a plausible approach to the separation (as measured by scores on written summaries).

**M 5: Writing Lab Reports (O: 1, 2, 4)**
BIOL3810 students write formal lab reports for an experiment involving protein isolation and identification

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**
70% of students earn 75% or better on the lab report

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of students scored 80% or better (two chances were given).

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
70% of students earn 75% or better on the lab report

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of students scored 80% or better (two chances were given).

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
70% of students earn 75% or better on the lab report

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% of students scored 80% or better (two chances were given).

**M 6: 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**
70% of students can score 70% or better on the exam question.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% scored 70% or better on this assignment.

**Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology**
70% of students can score 70% or better on the exam question.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85% scored 70% or better on this assignment.

**M 7: Students will work well in groups (O: 2, 3, 5)**
Students in BIOL2107K worked in groups on specific projects as outreach programs

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
75% of students will contribute significantly to the final written product.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
96% of students contributed significantly to produce an acceptable final written product.

**Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology**
75% of students will contribute significantly to the final written product.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
96% of students contributed significantly to produce an acceptable final written product.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**
75% of students will contribute significantly to the final written product.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
96% of students contributed significantly to produce an acceptable final written product.

M 8: 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 should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
89% scored 70% (3.5/5.0) or above. The median score was 88% (4.4/5.0).

Target for O4: Content in Biology
75% of students should score 70% or higher (3.5/5.0).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
89% scored 70% (3.5/5.0) or above. The median score was 88% (4.4/5.0).

M 9: 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
70% of students should score 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
60% of students received a score of 70% or higher.

M 10: Use of Supplemental Instruction (O: 1, 4)
Students in introductory (Biol 1103K, 1104K, 2107K and 2108K) and gateway (Biol 3800) courses will be offered peer-led supplemental instruction (SI) sections.

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
Students who visit SI leaders at least twice during the semester will receive significantly higher grades in the course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
905 students took courses containing optional SI sections; 297 participated in at least two SI sections, and 608 did not. The average course grade for SI attendees was 2.95 compared with an average course grade of 2.60 for non-attendees (significant at p<0.001).

Target for O4: Content in Biology
Students who visit SI leaders at least twice during the semester will receive significantly higher grades in the course.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
905 students took courses containing optional SI sections; 297 participated in at least two SI sections, and 608 did not. The average course grade for SI attendees was 2.95 compared with an average course grade of 2.60 for non-attendees (significant at p<0.001).

M 11: Use basic equipment in laboratory courses (O: 1, 5)
Students demonstrate proper use of micropipettors.

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
70% can score 75% or better

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
72% of students scored 75% or better on the practical exam question.

Target for O5: Critical thinking
70% can score 75% or better

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
72% of students scored 75% or better on the practical exam question.

**M 12: Demonstrate an understanding of scientific termino (O: 4)**
Students answered a test question which focused on “SDS-PAGE” and “molecular weight”.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
80% of students can perform at 80% or better on a test question

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of scored 80% or better on the question

**M 13: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students in BIOL2800 scored 70% or better on this assignment.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students in BIOL2800 scored 70% or better on this assignment.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students in BIOL2800 scored 70% or better on this assignment.

**M 14: Content: Genetics (O: 4)**
Given the nucleotide sequence of an mRNA, students in Biol 2107K were asked to sketch the coded polypeptide chain. This hint was provided: [Translation is initiated when a “START” codon is encountered, and is terminated when a “STOP” codon is reached]

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
70% of students should score 70% or better on this question.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
75% of students scored 70% or higher on this question.

**M 15: Content: Molecular Processes (O: 4, 5)**
Students answered a test question about the how protein conformation affects its function.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**
75% of students earn 80% or higher on the test question.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
88% of students scored 80% or better on this question.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**
75% of students earn 80% or higher on the test question.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
88% of students scored 80% or better on this question.

**M 16: Content: Carbon source utilization (O: 2, 4)**
Students in Biol 2108K were asked the following question: You notice that your yogurt has "active cultures" in it. Are these organisms chemoautrotrophic or chemoheterotropic and what carbon source are they using for food? Name the organism in your yogurt.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
75% of students score 80% or better on this question.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
83% of students scored 80% or higher on this question.

Target for O4: Content in Biology
75% of students scored 80% or better on this question.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
83% of students scored 80% or higher on this question.

M 17: Use computers for data analysis, literature search (O: 1, 2)
Students identify on Pubmed and summarize a primary literature paper as part of Biol 3810.

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
80% of students will correctly perform the task (80% level or higher)

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
95% of students scored 80% or better

Target for O2: Scientific Communication
80% of students will correctly perform the task (80% level or higher)

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
95% of students scored 80% or better

M 18: Logical Hypothesis formulation (O: 1, 2, 5)
Students were assigned an at-home experiment where they observed the enzymatic browning of apples under different conditions. A report on the experimental approaches and the observed results was written.

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
90% of the students scored at least 75% on graded paper

Target for O2: Scientific Communication
90% of the students scored at least 75% on graded paper

Target for O5: Critical thinking
90% of the students scored at least 75% on graded paper

M 19: Predict changes that accompany Biological problems (O: 1, 5)
Students were asked to predict the relative concentrations of metabolites if critical enzymes in a metabolic pathway were mutated and nonfunctional.

Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry
75% were able to correctly predict at least 75% of the outcomes.

Target for O5: Critical thinking
75% were able to correctly predict at least 75% of the outcomes.

M 20: Working productively as a group (O: 2, 5)
Students were given an exercise that demands that they interpret scientific data and make conclusions based on their findings as a group. Also, they were expected to formulate new experiments based on their findings.

Target for O2: Scientific Communication
90% of the students met at least 80% of the expected goals.

Target for O5: Critical thinking
90% of the students met at least 80% of the expected goals.

M 21: Ability to apply chemistry to biological problems (O: 4)
Students were expected to form chemical bonds between amino acid side chains and a substrate molecule. This integrates basic chemistry with Biology I.

Target for O4: Content in Biology
70% of the students were 75% successful
### M 22: Writing about molecular processes (O: 2, 4, 5)

Students wrote a full scientific report that detailed their experimental approach and data analysis. The subject dealt with cellular components and molecular assays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>18 of 22 received at least an 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Content in Biology</td>
<td>18 of 22 received at least an 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical thinking</td>
<td>18 of 22 received at least an 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 23: Deliver presentations with written abstracts (O: 2)

Each student will present a mini lecture and provide 1-page summary.

| Target for O2: Scientific Communication | 86% of students scored 80% or higher |

### M 24: Critique and analyze scientific literature (O: 1, 2, 5)

Students will critique (1) a statement from the textbook and (2) a figure from same textbook. Data are reported as % of students who cite refs properly.

| Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry      | Critique a statement: 70% of students scored 80% or higher |
| Target for O2: Scientific Communication| Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher. |
| Target for O5: Critical thinking       | Critique a statement: 70% of students scored 80% or higher |
|                                       | Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher. |

### M 25: Predict changes that accompany Biological problems (O: 1, 2, 5)

Students were expected to critically determine the outcome of different patients’ pregnancy tests

| Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry      | avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9% |
| Target for O2: Scientific Communication| avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9% |
| Target for O5: Critical thinking       | avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9% |

### 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
- **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
Develop problem solving skills (critiquing data)

Students are given different sets of hypothetical data and be asked to interpret the results and formulate hypothesis and experiments.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Analysis of data | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Construct Hypothesis | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Content: Molecular Processes | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
Measure: Critique and analyze scientific literature | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
| Scientific Communication | Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Logical Hypothesis formulation | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
| Scientific Communication | Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Predict changes that accompany Biological problems | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
| Scientific Communication | Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Retrieval of data from databases | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
| Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Use computers for data analysis, literature search | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
| Scientific Inquiry
Measure: Writing Lab Reports | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
| Scientific Inquiry

Implementation Description: Current
Responsible Person/Group: Therese Poole, Frank Cruz

---
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---

**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.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 54 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 30 (56%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 22 (73%) received an "excellent" ranking, 7 (23%) received a "satisfactory" ranking, and 1 (3%) received an "unsatisfactory" ranking. Of the remaining 24 students, one withdrew from the course, and the remaining 23 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp07 semester, 9 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 39 (76%) had completed the course, with 26 (67%) rated "excellent," 10 (26%) rated "satisfactory," and 3 (8%) rated "unsatisfactory." Therefore, 92% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 26% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (66%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 54 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 30 (56%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 22 (73%) received an "excellent" ranking, 7 (23%) received a "satisfactory" ranking, and 1 (3%) received an "unsatisfactory" ranking. Of the remaining 24 students, one withdrew from the course, and the remaining 23 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp07 semester, 9 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 39 (76%) had completed the course, with 26 (67%) rated "excellent," 10 (26%) rated "satisfactory," and 3 (8%) rated "unsatisfactory." Therefore, 92% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 26% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (66%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 54 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 30 (56%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 22 (73%) received an "excellent" ranking, 7 (23%) received a "satisfactory" ranking, and 1 (3%) received an "unsatisfactory" ranking. Of the remaining 24 students, one withdrew from the course, and the remaining 23 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp07 semester, 9 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 39 (76%) had completed the course, with 26 (67%) rated "excellent," 10 (26%) rated "satisfactory," and 3 (8%) rated "unsatisfactory." Therefore, 92% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 26% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (66%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All stx proposals were approved.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All stx proposals were approved.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All stx proposals were approved.
**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**
60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

**Target for O3: Scientific Content**
60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

**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):**
- Scientific Content | Scientific Inquiry

**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?
Students in the MS program continue to meet the target performance goal for completion of the degree, with the median time between entry into the program and receipt of degree remaining around 2.4 years. The average time for completion of degree (3.0 years) was slightly higher than during the previous cycle (2.7 years), but this may reflect the fact that some students who had been in the doctoral program for several years took advantage of a new opportunity being offered that allows doctoral students to receive an optional MS degree.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although eventually nearly all non-thesis MS students complete their non-thesis capstone paper with a Satisfactory or higher rating, nearly half continue to require more than one semester to do so.
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.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A total of 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.11 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A total of 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.11 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A total of 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.11 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received
the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Sp07 semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their evaluation.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Sp07 semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their evaluation.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Sp07 semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their evaluation.

**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

**Continued implementation of advisement procedures**

The advisement procedures implemented during the last cycle appear to be successful in improving the amount of time between entry and completion of the program, and will be continued.

*Established in Cycle:* 2006-2007  
*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 2007  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Graduate directors in the four disciplines

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The time from entry into the program and receipt of degree continues to decrease. Our goal was for 50% of our students to complete the degree within 6.5 years. This year, 87% of those completing the degree met the 6.5-year target, a significant improvement from last year (45%). In addition, 75% of students taking the Ph.D. qualifying exam received an unconditional Pass on their first attempt (meeting the target performance level), while 94% of students received a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending (exceeding the target performance level of 90%).

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

None
### 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.

**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)
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students should be able to qualitatively state the key issues clearly and accurately the issues in a business problem.

**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.

**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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**

The average score on the four different measures of student capabilities set out above was 4.1, which meets the desired level of student performance.

#### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**

The average score on the four different measures of student capabilities set out above was 4.41, which meets the desired level of student performance.
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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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):**

- **Measure:** Application of Statistical Tools  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
- **Measure:** Decision Process Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving Processes
- **Measure:** Modeling Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Modeling Skills

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** BA Faculty Members  
**Additional Resources:** None

#### Course Evaluation

1. All Business Analysis faculty members evaluate their courses on an ongoing basis, as well as the relationships between their courses to ensure that the program is current and comprehensive in this field.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Application of Statistical Tools  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
- **Measure:** Decision Process Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving Processes
- **Measure:** Modeling Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Modeling Skills

**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members

#### Database Updates

Update datasets for courses that focus on analytical techniques to make them more current and relevant.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Application of Statistical Tools  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
- **Measure:** Decision Process Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving Processes
- **Measure:** Modeling Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Modeling Skills

**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members

#### Software Acquisition

Find sources of affordable software for students to practice advanced analytical techniques.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Application of Statistical Tools  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
- **Measure:** Decision Process Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving Processes
- **Measure:** Modeling Skills  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Modeling Skills

**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

The Business Analysis concentration for the MBA as well as the MS program have continued to attract students with relatively strong general ability (GMAT scores) and a desire to excel in quantitative analysis. Given this self-selection bias of students in the program, the performances have been consistently above average. Students have demonstrated skills in mapping a business process, identifying improvement opportunities, developing mathematical models in spreadsheets as well as with specialized software like SPSS and SAS, developing Decision Support Systems, and interpreting results for improved decision making. Overall, the quality of student performances in this area has been excellent over the past year.

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

One of the main areas of improvement is access to diverse datasets and software packages for more advanced analytical techniques. Currently, SAS and SPSS do not offer (within the scope of the licenses available at the University) the ability to build Neural Network models, Classification Trees, or Text Data Mining. Availability to students of inexpensive software for these tasks in the future will make the Data Mining course even stronger than it currently is. The courses as designed seem to currently satisfy the needs of the students in the workplace. Feedback received from students indicates that in general they are well-prepared for careers in this area after completion of the program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Chemistry BS

As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 involvement 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. 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.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A representative sample of laboratory reports from Chem 1211, 1212, 3100, 3110, 4000, 4010 4190, and 4160 were evaluated. All units with the exception of chem 1211, 3100 and 4010 showed overall improvement in writing skills. Chem 1211 and 3100 scores were statistically the same as last year. Chem 4010 reports showed a slight drop in overall ability. All areas met the target goal of the department.

**Target for O2: Technology**

All laboratory courses are expected to have a minimum value of 3 in each of the 4 learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A representative sample of laboratory reports from Chem 1211, 1212, 3100, 3110, 4000, 4010 4190, and 4160 were evaluated. All units with the exception of chem 1211, 3100 and 4010 showed overall improvement in writing skills. Chem 1211 and 3100 scores were statistically the same as last year. Chem 4010 reports showed a slight drop in overall ability. All areas met the target goal of the department.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A representative sample of laboratory reports from Chem 1211, 1212, 3100, 3110, 4000, 4010 4190, and 4160 were evaluated. All units with the exception of chem 1211, 3100 and 4010 showed overall improvement in writing skills. Chem 1211 and 3100 scores were statistically the same as last year. Chem 4010 reports showed a slight drop in overall ability. All areas met the target goal of the department.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

A representative sample of laboratory reports from Chem 1211, 1212, 3100, 3110, 4000, 4010 4190, and 4160 were evaluated. All units with the exception of chem 1211, 3100 and 4010 showed overall improvement in writing skills. Chem 1211 and 3100 scores were statistically the same as last year. Chem 4010 reports showed a slight drop in overall ability. All areas met the target goal of the department.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The ACS exit exam scores were as follows 1151- 72rd percentile, 1152- 62th percentile, 1211-53st percentile, 1212- 32nd percentile, 3410- 54th percentile 4110- 57th , 4210- 57th and 4610-XX. Lower Division Classes (Non-Majors, General andOrganic The exit scores for 1151 and 1152 were stable compared to the 2005-2006 numbers. This shows an 6 percentile improvement in 1211 exit scores. This is a good indication that the placement exam and the peer tutorial support descibed in the 2005-2006 action plan (Action 1) along with aggressive early advisement (Action 2) has led to improvement in the scores for 1211. The DWF rate for 1211 in 2005-2006 was 32% and for 2006-2007 dropped to 23%. The ACS exit score for 1212 dropped by 10 percentile from the 2005-2006 report but there was also a 10% drop in the DWF rate (29% vs 19%) from 2005-2006. The 3410 exit exam was in the 54th percentile which is a slight drop from last year(59th).

Upper division classes were statistically simular to last year.

**Target for O3: Quantitative skills**

The departmental goal is at least the 50th percentile on all ACS exit exams

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The ACS exit exam scores were as follows 1151- 72rd percentile, 1152- 62th percentile, 1211-53st percentile, 1212- 32nd percentile, 3410- 54th percentile 4110- 57th , 4210- 57th and 4610-XX. Lower Division Classes (Non-Majors, General andOrganic The exit scores for 1151 and 1152 were stable compared to the 2005-2006 numbers. This shows an 6 percentile improvement in 1211 exit scores. This is a good indication that the placement exam and the peer tutorial support descibed in the 2005-2006 action plan (Action 1) along with aggressive early advisement (Action 2) has led to improvement in the scores for 1211. The DWF rate for 1211 in 2005-2006 was 32% and for 2006-2007 dropped to 23%. The
ACS exit score for 1212 dropped by 10 percentile from the 2005-2006 report but there was also a 10% drop in the DWF rate (29% vs 19%) from 2005-2006. The 3410 exit exam was in the 54th percentile which is a slight drop from last year (59th). Upper division courses were statistically similar to last year.

**Target for O4: Contemporary Issues**
The departmental goal is at least the 50th percentile on all ACS exit exams.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The ACS exit exam scores were as follows: 1151-72nd percentile, 1152-62th percentile, 1211-53st percentile, 1212-32nd percentile, 3410-54th percentile 4110-57th, 4210-57th and 4610-XX. Lower Division Classes (Non-Majors, General and Organic) The exit scores for 1151 and 1152 (chemistry for non-majors) were stable compared to the 2005-2006 numbers. This shows an 6 percentile improvement in 1211 exit scores. This is a good indication that the placement exam and the peer tutorial support described in the 2005-2006 action plan (Action 1) along with aggressive early advisement (Action 2) has led to improvement in the scores for 1211. The DWF rate for 1211 in 2005-2006 was 32% and for 2006-2007 dropped to 23%. The ACS exit score for 1212 dropped by 10 percentile from the 2005-2006 report but there was also a 10% drop in the DWF rate (29% vs 19%) from 2005-2006. The 3410 exit exam was in the 54th percentile which is a slight drop from last year (59th). Upper division courses were statistically similar to last year.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Three year retention rates have not yet been reported to the department. The student perceptions in all areas with the exception of Organic lecture (3.9/5.0), Upper level lecture (4.1/5.0) and upper level lab (4.2/5.0) exceeded 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Three year retention rates have not yet been reported to the department. The student perceptions in all areas with the exception of Organic lecture (3.9/5.0), Upper level lecture (4.1/5.0) and upper level lab (4.2/5.0) exceeded 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Three year retention rates have not yet been reported to the department. The student perceptions in all areas with the exception of Organic lecture (3.9/5.0), Upper level lecture (4.1/5.0) and upper level lab (4.2/5.0) exceeded 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Three year retention rates have not yet been reported to the department. The student perceptions in all areas with the exception of Organic lecture (3.9/5.0), Upper level lecture (4.1/5.0) and upper level lab (4.2/5.0) exceeded 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Three year retention rates have not yet been reported to the department. The student perceptions in all areas with the exception of Organic lecture (3.9/5.0), Upper level lecture (4.1/5.0) and upper level lab (4.2/5.0) exceeded 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content/concept assessment | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative skills

Responsible Person/Group: Kathy Grant, Al Baumstark

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%

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Miscellaneous assessments | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Paul Franklin, Doyle Barrow, Al Baumstark

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content/concept assessment | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Freshman area instructors will be in charge of the administering the exam.

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content/concept assessment | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
  | Quantitative skills
- Measure: Miscellaneous assessments | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
  | Quantitative skills | Technology

Implementation Description: Fall 06
Responsible Person/Group: Laboratory instructors

continue freshman area emphasis
The addition of tutorials, early advisement and pre-course placement testing.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content/concept assessment | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues
  | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills
- Measure: Miscellaneous assessments | Outcome/Objective: Communication skills
  | Contemporary Issues | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology

Implementation Description: Ongoing effort
Responsible Person/Group: Doyle Barrow
Additional Resources: Funding has been provided by the office of the Provost.

Stability in the Organic Division
Provide permanent positions for persons teaching the organic division courses

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Communication (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

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.

**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.

**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.

**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

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed exams.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
80% pass

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed exams.

**Target for O3: Technology**
80% pass

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed exams.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
80% pass

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed exams.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
80% pass

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed exams.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed thesis defense.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed thesis defense.

**Target for O3: Technology**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed thesis defense.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed thesis defense.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 12 masters students passed thesis defense.

**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):**
  - Measure: general exam | Comunication | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology
  - Measure: thesis/paper | Comunication | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mark Germann, Al Baumstark

**Continued Quzality and Growth**
The M.S. program meets departmental standards.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Gadda

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
none

---

**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 Ph.D. Students 5 Ph.D.’s awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Communication Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: The undergraduate program is ACS certified and the same writing style is used in all graduate programs.</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>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Technology (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Quantitative Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Contemporary Issues (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed the seminar course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed the seminar course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed the seminar course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Quantitative Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed the seminar course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Contemporary Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed the seminar course.

**M 2: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
5 students took the general exam 4 passed unconditionally 1 passed conditionally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
5 students took the general exam 4 passed unconditionally 1 passed conditionally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5 students took the general exam 4 passed unconditionally 1 passed conditionally

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
80% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5 students took the general exam 4 passed unconditionally 1 passed conditionally

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
80% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5 students took the general exam 4 passed unconditionally 1 passed conditionally

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
12 students passed 0 failed

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
95% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
12 students passed 0 failed

Target for O3: Technology
95% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
12 students passed 0 failed

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
95% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
12 students passed 0 failed

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
95% pass
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
12 students passed 0 failed

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

Continued Quality
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
continued quality and growth

The department has met all its goals and will continue to grow while keeping the quality of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gadda

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Communication Disorders MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST

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

---

### Mission / Purpose

The Communication Disorders (CD) Program is a unit of the Educational Psychology & Special Education Department. The mission of the CD Program is to offer a high quality master's degree program which educates students to implement evidence-based services across the scope of practice in speech-language pathology. The program will achieve this goal through the continual pursuit of excellence in academic and clinical education and by infusion of research and scholarly experiences appropriate to a master’s degree program. We will utilize the unique strengths of our community’s diverse population and our numerous affiliated sites to prepare fully-certified speech-language pathologists who are exceptionally well-qualified to work in schools, hospitals, private clinics, and rehabilitation programs throughout the state. During the 2006-07 academic year there were 42 students enrolled in the program and 10 students graduated.

---

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity (M: 1, 2, 22)**

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, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12)**

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, 8, 13)**

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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs

**O/O 4: Evaluate Research Relevance (M: 1, 8, 14)**

The student can critically evaluate published theory and research to determine its relevance and application to clinical practice in communication 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
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues (M: 1, 8, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Outline Professional Credentials (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention (M: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.3 Quality professional programs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities (M: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 11: Apply Technology (M: 1, 6, 7, 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student uses appropriate technology for clinical assessment and intervention and for professional productivity.</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (M: 1, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and 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>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 13: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 14: Describe Communication &amp; Swallowing Processes (M: 1, 2, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can describe normal communication and swallowing processes and behaviors including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.</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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Praxis II Exam (Total Score) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 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 (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).

**Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).

**Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).

**Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Apply Technology**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**
95% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores for 9 out 10 students were received. All 9 passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with an average score of 705 (range = 640-750).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Praxis II Exam Category I Score (Comm Process) (O: 1, 14)**
Score for Category I Basic Human Communication Processes.

**Target for O1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity**
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 2, 13)**
Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.6.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.1.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.1.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.4.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.4.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 5.3.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 5.3.</td>
<td>All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 5.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 2, 13)**

Score for Category III Speech Disorders.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.1.

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.1.

**M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 2, 13)**

Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.4.

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.4.

**M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 2, 11, 13)**

Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

Due to the small number of questions in this area (7 or fewer), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 5/7 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 9 students taking the exam was 5.3.

**Target for O11: Apply Technology**

Due to the small number of questions in this area (7 or fewer), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 5/7 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 9 students taking the exam was 5.3.

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

Due to the small number of questions in this area (7 or fewer), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 5/7 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 9 students taking the exam was 5.3.

**M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (O: 2, 11)**

Score for Category VI Clinical Management
### Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.7.

### Target for O11: Apply Technology
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.7.

### M 8: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) (O: 3, 4, 5)
Score for Category VII Professional Issues, Psychometrics, Research

### Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.2.

### Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.2.

### Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
Students will score within the national average performance range or above. Performance below the range is scored as a 1, within the range as 2, and above the range as 3. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 2.5 or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
All 9 students taking the exam scored within the national average performance range or above. The overall program performance score was 2.2.

### M 9: Portfolio Section 1 (Prereq Knowledge) (O: 12)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they have met the prerequisite requirements of the program.

**Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Eight of the 10 students had a rating of 3 on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.8.

### M 10: Portfolio Section 2 (Comm & Swallow Process) (O: 14)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can describe the normal communication and swallowing processes.

**Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Five of the 10 students had a rating of 3 on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.3.

### M 11: Portfolio Section 3 (Comm & Swallow Disord) (O: 13)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of communication and swallowing...
disorders.

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Six of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.9.

M 12: Portfolio Section 4 (Prin Assess & Interv) (O: 2)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Four of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.4.

M 13: Portfolio Section 5 (Stds Ethical Conduct) (O: 3)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.

**Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Eight of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 3.1.

M 14: Portfolio Section 6 (Eval Research) (O: 4)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can critically evaluate published theory and research.

**Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Six of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.9.

M 15: Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) (O: 5)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards, practice guidelines, and practice management.

**Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Seven of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.9.

M 16: Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials) (O: 6)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must outline the requirements for national and state certification and licensure.

**Target for O6: Outline Professional Credentials**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Seven of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.8.

M 17: Portfolio Section 9 (Comm Skills) (O: 7)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they have appropriate oral and written communication skills.
### Target for O7: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Met  
Eight of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 3.1.

### M 18: Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) (O: 8)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they can accurately assess clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders.

### Target for O8: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Not Met  
Six of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.9.

### M 19: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills Interven) (O: 9)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can develop and implement functional and effective intervention programs.

### Target for O9: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Met  
Seven of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 3.1.

### M 20: Portfolio Section 12 (Interpersonal Qual) (O: 10)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they have appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and are able to self-evaluate clinical performance.

### Target for O10: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Met  
Eight of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 3.1.

### M 21: Portfolio Section 13 (Apply Technology) (O: 11)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they can use appropriate technology for assessment, intervention, and professional productivity.

### Target for O11: Apply Technology
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Met  
Seven of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 3.3.

### M 22: Portfolio Section 14 (Ling & Cult Diversity) (O: 1)
All master’s degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate their knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders.

### Target for O1: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Not Met  
Five of the 10 students had a rating of 3 or above on this portfolio section with the average rating being 2.9.

### 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...
**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
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty

**Curriculum review.**
During its on-going curriculum review, the CD faculty will review course content related to the outcomes noted below (2, 3, and 7) to determine if any changes in course content are warranted.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Praxis II Exam Category I Score (Comm Process) | **Outcome/Objective:** Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
- **Measure:** Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
- **Measure:** Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
- **Measure:** Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues

**Implementation Description:** December 1, 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** All CD faculty members.

---

**Expand information in the Student Handbook.**
For the first time the program has linked ratings on the individual sections of the portfolio with the learning outcomes in WEAVEonline. Based on the faculty’s review of student portfolios and the data collected for this assessment, we believe that students have acquired the knowledge and skills required by the program. However, some students are having difficulty selecting appropriate artifacts and writing reflections that meet faculty expectations and submitting those materials by the required deadlines. Although the CD Program’s Student Handbook contains guidelines for the portfolio, students would benefit from having additional information.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 1 (Prereq Knowledge) | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 14 (Ling & Cult Diversity) | **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 2 (Comm & Swallow Process) | **Outcome/Objective:** Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 3 (Comm & Swallow Disord) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 4 (Prin Assess & Interv) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 6 (Eval Research) | **Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Research Relevance
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials) | **Outcome/Objective:** Outline Professional Credentials

**Implementation Description:** September 1, 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Colleen M. O’Rourke, Program Coordinator

---

**Provide for additional discussion of portfolio.**
For the first time the program has linked ratings on the individual sections of the portfolio with the learning outcomes in WEAVEonline. Based on the faculty’s review of student portfolios and the data collected for this assessment, we believe that students have acquired the knowledge and skills required by the program. However, some students are having difficulty selecting appropriate artifacts and writing reflections that meet faculty expectations and submitting those materials by the required deadlines. Although the guidelines for the portfolio are discussed in one class, students would benefit from having additional instruction and discussions. These will take place in EXC 7590, EXC 7630, and in all classes that have assignments appropriate for artifacts. This additional instruction should assist students in selecting appropriate artifacts that document their achievement of the learning outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 1 (Prereq Knowledge) | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 14 (Ling & Cult Diversity) | **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 2 (Comm & Swallow Process) | **Outcome/Objective:** Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 3 (Comm & Swallow Disord) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 4 (Prin Assess & Interv) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 6 (Eval Research) | **Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Research Relevance
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) | **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
- **Measure:** Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials) | **Outcome/Objective:** Outline Professional Credentials

**Implementation Description:** September 1, 2007
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The CD Program used the feedback provided by Dr. Harry Dangel on our 2005-2006 assessment report to modify our assessment plan. For the first time we linked the subsection scores of the Praxis II exam and the ratings for each section of the CD Program Portfolio to the program's learning outcomes. This allowed us to be more specific in our evaluation of how students are meeting the outcomes. The data from the total scores of the Praxis II exam for 2006-2007 show that our students continue to have a 100% pass rate on this national exam with an average score of over 700 (passing score = 600). The data from the 2005-2006 assessment used the number of CD Program Portfolio submissions as a target level. The faculty found that this measure did not incorporate assessment of how students were achieving each of the learning outcomes. By changing to a measurement that evaluates each section of the portfolio we are now able to assess each learning outcome. The data from the CD Program Portfolio for 2006-2007 show that all of our students continue to successfully complete their portfolios.

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

Although students are passing the Praxis II exam as evidenced by the total score data, the average subsection scores suggest that several content areas need to be examined more closely during the program's on-going curriculum review to determine if any modifications in course content are needed. All students are successful in completing their program portfolios; however, the quality and timeliness of the submissions need improvement for several learning outcomes. The portfolio assessment identified a number of learning outcomes that fell just below our target level of 3.0 with scores of 2.8 and 2.9. In Fall 2006 changes were made in the portfolio procedures that we believe will raise these scores in the future. Our students take 2 to 3 years to complete the master's degree and their portfolios. The effects of changes in portfolio process and procedures will not be evident for 2 years. Two specific learning outcomes that need additional attention were identified: 2) Describe communication and swallowing processes; and 4) Discuss principles of assessment and intervention. These outcomes fell farthest from our target rating of 3.0 with ratings of 2.3 and 2.4 respectively. The CD Program has targeted the portfolio evaluation in the action plan and has devised a strategy that we believe will improve the ratings on these outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Communication MA**

*(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 Master of Arts degree. The program is designed to prepare students for professional activities in all areas of Communication in which the Department has emphases (mass communication, film/video and digital imaging, and human communication and social influence).

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand research methods (M: 3, 4)**

Students should be conversant in the wide range of research methodologies of the interdisciplinary field of communication. They should demonstrate competence in specific research methods appropriate to their area of specialization.

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: Oral and written competencies (M: 5)**

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 articulate and 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 (M: 2)**

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: Command of scholarly and creative work in area of (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate a command of the key texts in their area of specialization. These include theoretical and scholarly literature in the area; additionally, for the Film/Video specialization, it includes a breadth of knowledge of the important artistic works, styles, and movements that comprise the film canon.

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: Theory Exam (O: 4)**

Final theory paper for our required Issues and Perspectives in Communication course (Comm 6010)

**Target for O4: Command of scholarly and creative work in area of**

Score of 80 to 100% on final theory papers

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

17 out of 25 students completed their final theory paper with a score of 80% or above. This represents a 68% success rate.

**M 2: Quality of thesis content (O: 3)**

The successfully defended thesis shows a sufficient display of knowledge to be judged as "high quality."

**Target for O3: Knowledge development**

Theses should be judged as meeting at least a criterion of 4 out of 5 (5=high achievement)

**M 3: 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 submitted in the course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 22 students who completed the research methods course, 19 received scores of 80% or higher on the final proposal. Our success rate was 86%.

**M 4: Research Theses (O: 1)**

Successfully defended MA research theses

**Target for O1: Understand research methods**

100% success in thesis defenses

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

21 students successfully defended theses, and one student failed a thesis defense and subsequently left the program.

**M 5: Quality of thesis proposals and oral defenses (O: 2)**

After the defense, the thesis proposal will be given an (informal) aggregate grade on a scale from 0 to 5, with 2 representing a low pass, and 5 an outstanding performance.

**Target for O2: Oral and written competencies**

Proposals should be rated at least 4 (on a scale of 5).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

As of now, the mechanism we are using to evaluate the overall quality of theses is anecdotal, and we are seeking to create a way to keep track of this more systematically (see action item A 4). In the academic year 2006-07, 22 theses were defended;
there were 21 passes, and one failure (after which the student left the program). Certainly, a majority of these theses were considered by the committees to fall into the range of “very good” to “outstanding,” although a small percentage were judged to be only “adequate.” The Graduate Committee is currently working on a form in which defenses of all thesis proposals and theses can be evaluated, so that we can better track the quality of theses. One of the areas we want to investigate here is whether and to what extent the complex intellectual interactions that occur during the defense of the thesis proposal gets translated into the final thesis, in order to determine the precise point at which a proposal for a thesis should be failed (i.e., forced to be reconceptualized) in order to, in the end, produce a better finished thesis.

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

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
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
Implementation Description: Already underway and continuing
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee in conjunction with the Chair

Continue dev. of applied prog. non-thesis option
To continue the discussion and planning of a non-thesis applied option (and an accompanying curriculum) to meet the needs of MA students seeking additional skills training, rather than training for advanced research. Note that this does not apply to the screenwriting/production tracks of the Film/Video major, which is oriented toward artistic production and not skills training.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: graduate faculty, Graduate Directors, Graduate Committee, and Chair

Continue revision of the MA curriculum
The need for curricular revision at the MA level remains a central departmental concern. Beginning in 2005-06 and continuing to the present, the Graduate Studies Committee has been charged with conducting a major review of the MA curriculum, and this process will be ongoing in 2007-08. The revision of the MA curriculum is of critical importance not simply because of the wide range of areas of study that fall under the rubric of "communication." It also impacts in subtle ways the doctoral curriculum, as well as a major charge of the Graduate Studies Committee not directly related to the assessment of learning outcomes—namely, the need to recruit a larger and stronger pool of graduate applicants. The area faculty and Graduate Studies Committee will continue to work on revision of the MA curriculum in 2007-08. At the end of academic year 2006-07, the area faculty in film-video and MIS developed and approved the adoption of four new MA-level media studies courses, which will be sent to the Graduate Studies Committee in early 2007-08. These courses will allow us to phase out the 4000-6000 courses too prevalent in the Film-Video MA. They will serve to bridge the gap between production-focused students and critical studies students at the level of a masters degree and will serve as templates for an expanded list of courses available at the doctoral level.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Quality of thesis proposals and oral defenses | Outcome/Objective: Oral and written competencies
Evaluate appropriate methods for creative artists

In the year 2007-2008, the graduate committee should focus on adapting the Research Methods course to better suit needs of students in both theoretical and applied-creative tracks; and on implementing a method to monitor students’ selections of foreign-language research equivalence courses.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Research Proposals | Outcome/Objective: Understand research methods

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate directors, area graduate faculty, Graduate Committee

Implement better reporting of failed or postponed

Our current mechanism only keeps track of successful oral thesis proposal defenses and full thesis defenses. Although proposed in past years, we still do not have a form that records when a student fails an oral thesis proposal defense or an oral defense of the full thesis. This issue is complicated by the fact that in some cases, a defense can be "postponed" based on negative committee responses, and we have no way of monitoring the extent to which this occurs, except anecdotally. In the 2007-2008 year we will implement a form that will allow us to track failed defenses, as well as an informal procedure by which a thesis director can notify the graduate director of a postponed defense, thus allowing us to evaluate competence at both the level of written argumentation and the level of oral argumentation.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Quality of thesis proposals and oral defenses | Outcome/Objective: Oral and written competencies

Implementation Description: mid-Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee, graduate faculty

Monitor performance in Advanced Film Theory

Currently, we monitor performance in Comm 6010 to assess competence in the scholarly literature and theory of communication. Equally important for students in Film-Video is Comm 6020, Advanced Film Theory, which is currently being redesigned to bring theory together with the major aesthetic traditions in film. The performance in this course can provide more accurate assessment in this area, for both creative and critical studies students.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Theory Exam | Outcome/Objective: Command of scholarly and creative work in area of

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director in Film Video MIS.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The MA program continues to be strong. In 2006-07, we also began advising all MA students that they are required to select their principal advisor by the time they finish the seventh course in the program. Since it is only with the approval of the thesis advisor that students can securely obtain credit for the foreign-language research equivalence course, this rule will have an impact on the methodological sophistication of MA work. Considerable work has been accomplished on one of last year’s action plans, revision of the MA curriculum; and currently we are in the process of adding several courses to the Film/Video MA program. This will impact several other of the current action plans: it will allow us to phase out the 4000-6000 courses too prevalent in the Film-Video MA, it will serve to bridge the gap between production focused students and critical studies students at the level of a masters degree, and it will provide an expanded list of courses available at the doctoral level.

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

Several discussions have taken place in the Graduate Committee regarding implementation of the action plan of last year to move toward an applied program with a non-thesis option. Moving forward with this action item is closely tied to the development of a coherent applied curriculum, and the acquisition of personnel in the applied areas. There is also concern among some area faculty that Film/Video production not be considered an "applied" program, as our production MA focuses on aesthetic competence rather than job training. A related issue applicable only to the creative-track of the Film/Video MA connects to methods. In this area, due to the fundamentally aesthetic nature of the work done on the creative thesis, some of the traditional methodologies of communication studies seem less useful in these cases; and the traditional social-scientific distinction between method and content is problematic in aesthetics. Thus, at the end of academic year 2006-07, the area faculty in film-video and MIS was charged with rethinking the methods curriculum for this cohort of students, and they will report to the Graduate Studies Committee in early 2007-08. The area graduate faculty in the mass communication area are working on significant revisions to that degree track, reflective both of the fact that the university is situated in the middle of one of the nation’s leading media markets, and of the fact that cross-platform demands in the print and telecommunications sectors require graduate training less focused on particular media (print, broadcast, PR) and
more attentive to cross-platform modes of news production (such as online and new mediated forms of content dissemination).

Curricular transformation is likely to produce changes in the way track seminars address research methods and emerging industry dynamics, and also to result in modifications in courses relating to the public relations and corporate communication sector in particular, two areas where jobs requiring the M.A. have undergone the most rapid change. Area faculty in mass communication are also working to handle ongoing demands for professionalizing training in applied communication professions (such as PR) within the context of a program designed and organized around the priorities of scholarly research generation in mass communication. These conversations, reflective of broader disciplinary discussions (such as whether M.A. level programs in mass communication should be thought of as more akin to traditional research generating social sciences or to professional schools such as law and business), are understood by the department's faculty as requiring a recalibration of our offerings. The goals of these conversations include (a) preserving and enhancing the curricular and scholarly integrity of graduate instruction, (b) bringing M.A. level offerings in mass communication more in line with state-of-the-art practice, and (c) sustaining a program able to generate strong continuing enrollment. Area faculty are looking, in addition, to mechanisms that can better connect our graduate students with best/new practices in journalism production, most likely as a supplement to regular coursework and the more traditional vehicles for assessing learning outcomes at the graduate level. The main challenge to curricular coherence in the HC&SI track is that it continues to attract a relatively small M.A. student cohort, and this small group is split among two tracks, one mainly social scientific (and concentrated on communication patterns across the lifespan) and the other mainly humanistic (and focused on rhetorical/political studies). Because class cohorts are small, course management strategies are complex (e.g., if too many seminars are offered none will generate sufficient enrollment) and the task of creating meaningful curricular experiences is too easily undone by the wide flexibility students are permitted to make elective course choices. Area faculty have been working this year to address a similar situation at the undergraduate level (where a relatively small "speech" major is also split), and is moving to unify the two tracks into a single and better designed one-track program. The outcomes of that process (described in more detail in the undergraduate "speech" major report) are likely to be transposed into a similar process of curricular review at the M.A. level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Research proficiency (M: 1, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven ability to engage in high quality independent research, evidencing competence in a broad range of methodologies (textual analysis, historical research, ethnographic data, etc., as appropriate to the context).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, 4)** |
| 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, 5)
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

SLO 5: Professional development competency (M: 3, 4)
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

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
All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory
All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

Target for O4: Oral and written communication competency
All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
64% of our GTAs received a score of 4.0 or higher on question 17 of their student evaluations in the courses they taught (Fall 06; Spr 07 evaluations not yet released to us). While this represents a decline from last year's 84%, it must be noted that the latter figure represents the entire year; GTAs who receive low evaluations in the fall, or who are beginning teachers, are given extra mentorship which tends to bring up the scores in the Spring. Thus, we expect the percentage to approach last year's when the spring evaluations are available. In the aggregate, there was no grade inflation in these courses.

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
All doctoral students are expected to present, minimally, one conference paper per year (after the first year in the program), and
to publish at least one article before defending the dissertation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
In 2006-07 our students presented 32 papers at conferences and conventions, and published 14 essays (including articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries). No student was placed on probation for failure to meet minimum expectations in these areas.

M 4: Final papers in doctoral seminars (O: 1, 3, 5)
While papers written for doctoral seminars are not generally ready to submit to journals, it is expected that, in order for a paper to receive an A in a doctoral seminar, it poses an original and significant research question and approaches it with enough theoretical and methodological sophistication that relatively minor revisions would allow the paper to be submitted for publication.

Target for O1: Research proficiency
Because of the varying levels of previous training among students in a doctoral seminar (depending on the student=s year in the program, the student=s previous MA training, etc.), it is unrealistic to expect a 100 percent level. We would like to see a level of about 75%.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Of the final papers submitted in doctoral seminars in 2006-07, 63% scored at above 90 (on a 100 point scale).

Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory
Because of the varying levels of previous training among students in a doctoral seminar (depending on the student=s year in the program, the student=s previous MA training, etc.), it is unrealistic to expect a 100 percent level. We would like to see a level of about 75%.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Of the final papers submitted in doctoral seminars in 2006-07, 63% scored at above 90 (on a 100 point scale).

Target for O5: Professional development competency
Because of the varying levels of previous training among students in a doctoral seminar (depending on the student=s year in the program, the student=s previous MA training, etc.), it is unrealistic to expect a 100 percent level. We would like to see a level of about 75%.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Of the final papers submitted in doctoral seminars in 2006-07, 63% scored at above 90 (on a 100 point scale).

M 5: Faculty assessment of conference papers (O: 4)
The department of communication requires all doctoral students to present new work in a one-day, annual student conference organized in early April. Faculty respondents provide verbal responses to the papers, and later students arrange to meet respondents for detailed feedback.

Target for O4: Oral and written communication competency
Currently, we have no mechanism in place to quantify the results in this measure, aside from relying on oral reporting from respondents. We are working on implementing a system for recording faculty responses on student conference presentations.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance at the student conference was mixed, with some students performing at an acceptably high level, while others not meeting professional expectations.

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):
More faculty observation of teaching

Our students generally are a strong presence in the two national conferences corresponding to the two doctoral tracks [the NCA conference and the Society for Cinema and Media Studies conference], and we should continue to strongly advise students to propose papers to these conferences every year. Smaller conferences, however, can be invaluable in allowing students to present their work to top scholars in the field, giving them interactions which are often difficult to have at the extremely large national conferences. We should make our students aware of important small conferences that relate to specific areas of research they are doing, and encourage them to submit proposals to these conferences. Currently, in addition to providing every doctoral student with $800 in annual professional development (typically conference) support, we provide PhD students with additional funds based on their petitions to us for support to present at national and international venues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty response form for student conference

In order to provide students with more feedback on their performance in the annual doctoral student conference, as well as to provide a mechanism to measure this performance, a form should be developed in which all faculty in attendance can give responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>4/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate directors, graduate faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implement better reporting of failed or postponed

Our current mechanism only keeps track of successful oral dissertation proposal defenses and full dissertation defense. Although proposed in past years, we still do not have a form that records when a student fails an oral dissertation proposal defense or an oral defense of the full dissertation. This issue is complicated by the fact that in some cases, a defense can be Apostponed@ based on negative committee responses, and we have no way of monitoring the extent to which this occurs, except anecdotally. In the 2007-2008 year we will implement a form that will allow us to track failed defenses, as well as an informal procedure by which a dissertation director can notify the graduate director of a postponed defense, thus allowing us to evaluate competence at both the level of written argumentation, and the level of oral argumentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee, graduate faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase opportunities to revise written work

While the level of doctoral student publication is respectable, we should strive to increase the number of publications, especially of articles in peer-reviewed journals and collections. Two years ago, we instituted the Writing Proseminar, which is required of all doctoral students as one of the five required doctoral proseminars. We should consider expanding this requirement to two semesters; additionally, we should consider tracking the specific essays produced in these proseminars for submission and publication rates. Additionally, a few of our faculty have instituted the Awriting workshop@ as an integral end point to the doctoral seminar. In these workshops, the students distribute copies of drafts of their work to all students and the professor, for group discussion the following week. They then have one additional week to revise based on the seminar discussion. We should encourage continuation and expansion of these workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate directors, faculty teaching proseminar, Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More faculty observation of teaching

Our GTAs consistently score very high in the student evaluations of their teaching. Currently, we provide our GTAs with extensive training in pedagogy in their first semester as a teaching assistant. In addition, we provide extensive mentoring to any student whose evaluations fall below 4.0. We should consider doing more faculty observation of teaching on a regular basis for all GTAs, not because we see a problem in the quality of the teaching, but in order to enhance an already excellent record of performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</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 performance of our doctoral students in undergraduate teaching and in presenting their work at national conferences remains excellent. We believe that the latter is partly due to successful implementation of one of last year's action items, "Create more opportunities for oral argumentation." (An anecdotal example: one of our doctoral students recently wrote comprehensive examinations which the committee felt was between a Pass and a High Pass. During the oral defense, the student handled the questions so confidently that the committee gave the exam as a whole a High Pass.) The number of applicants to our doctoral program remains steady, but due to an initial effort at recruitment in the Moving Image Studies unit, we found that the quality of the applicants to this program was much higher than normal, and that we had attracted students receiving M.A.s from highly ranked film/mediaprograms across the country. In the Public Comm doctoral track we have now fully implemented core and elective course sequences in all sub-areas, and in both MIS and Public we have created four year course rotations which we will circulate to students in the fall, and which we hope will enable them to more confidently plan their program of study. In addition, we have revised our tenure-track hiring plan in ways that connect to some of the student-learning outcomes. For example, Moving Image Studies will be conducting a search for a new media scholar who will be able to integrate publishing in non-traditional formats into the seminars, thus connecting to some of the writing outcomes discussed above.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The other of last year's action items, "Implement better reporting on failed defenses," is only partially achieved and needs continued attention in 2007-08. The initial premise was that failure in a defense was primarily the result of lack of oral advocacy skills. In fact, we have found that in some cases, a failure in a defense is attributable more to conceptual problems in the work itself (i.e., as written), which only secondarily manifests itself in the oral argument. Thus, we have added action items having to do with increasing student opportunities for revisions of writing.

Georgia State University
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(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 in 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 tomorrow's organizations. Number of graduates from this BBA CIS degree program this academic year: Summer 2006 16 Fall 2006 18 Spring 2007 19 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2006 140 Fall 2006 259 Spring 2007 259 The assessment report for the BBA CIS for 2005-2006 maybe found at: http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RCB/RCB-LOA06/CISBBAA-LOA-06.htm The assessment report for the BBA CIS for 2004-2005 maybe found at: http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RCB/RCB-LOA05/CISBBBA-LOA-05.htm

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 write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by the client.
organizations. The ability of students to write object-oriented programs 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Survey average of 4.64 exceeded target.

#### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Survey average of 4.74 exceeded target.

#### 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>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Survey average of 4.77 exceeded target.

#### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
4.71 survey average was excellent.

#### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
4.8 survey average was excellent!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Developed Program Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Designed user interface (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**

4.0

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

4.61 survey average exceeded target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**

4.0

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

4.47 survey average was good! Target exceeded.

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

**Recruitment and Retention**

While no current measure of objective achievement is unmet, the CIS department (as well as those throughout the nation) has experienced a substantial decline in majors. To address this, the CIS department has initiated several activities. One of these is the redesign of the undergraduate curriculum. Even though this current program is ranked among the top 10 in the nation, the department decided to reevaluate the program in terms of the advancement of technology over the last decade and the changes in use of information systems within the business community. Please see http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/bbacinewcurriculum.asp for additional information. The department, college, students, and the business community are excited about this evolving curriculum which they have helped form. In addition, the CIS department proposed and received a university grant to set up CIS Learning Communities (CLC). Please see http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/RPG-RCB-CIS3-15-07.htm. Other activities in this area include establishment of a CIS Society, the hiring of a CIS Student Activities Director, and the formation of a CIS Majors' portal to share information, to establish better communication, and to bring a sense of community. Subsequent assessment reports will report progress on this front (as well as progress on our more traditional program objectives and measures).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008 for curriculum and Spring 2008 for CLC
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CIS Assessment Coordinator and Associate Chair
- **Additional Resources:** Currently adequate.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The scores for all measures remained well above the targets. The assessment measurement data may be found at: http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/BBAAssessmentData20062007.xls.

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

Although the assessments did not identify any core program objective weaknesses (other than testing - software quality management which has just been added as an undergraduate course) we will strive toward continual improvement. CIS worked with industry to develop a new CIS curriculum during this last academic year (and implemented with the launch of the 2008-2009 catalog). CIS will continue to implement this new curriculum for this BBA program and to increase 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. CIS will also take steps to build a sense of community and provide additional support for CIS students throughout their program of study.
**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.

Number of graduates in the MS CIS degree program Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 8 8 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 5 13 7 Number of students in the MS CIS degree Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 31 34 27 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 38 57 46 The 2004-2005 assessment report for this program may be found at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/CIS_MS_Assessment_Report_9_16_2005.htm. While this document primarily addresses specific course-level assessment of our departmental programs, it is but part of a larger assessment and curricular improvement activities engaging the energy of CIS faculty for two very compelling reasons. The first arises from the core nature of our discipline and the second arises from purely economic realities. 1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political realities may lead. 2) Economic necessity. The triple-whammy of the dot com implosion, the economic downturn of post 9/11 economy and the accelerated global sourcing of digital work have conspired to reverse a 15 year trend of enrollment growth to a period of contraction and rebuilding. The net result of these continuous and dramatic underlying technological and social changes is that the content of virtually all CIS courses and the curriculum itself is in constant flux. Thus, by technical and economic necessity, the CIS faculty are confronted with compelling reasons for continuous improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer three examples as evidence of this attention to continuous curricular improvement. The first is that in the past 5 years the curriculum has undergone two major revisions at each the undergraduate and graduate programs and is in the stages of yet another substantial revamping. Secondly, three times in the past five years faculty have engaged Chief Information Officers and other leaders from major Atlanta Metropolitan business and service industry organizations in group discussion covering the nature and content of our programs and course offerings. A fourth such process is in the offing for early 2007. And thirdly, CIS faculty hold leadership positions in the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) special interest group on computer personnel research (SIG CPR) and make a specific study of study the changing technical skill sets required of our graduates in the workforce. Our faculty are represented on Microsoft’s academic advisory board and routinely engage with CIO and CTO level personnel in other industry and academic venues, which coupled with an active field research agenda provides a view of the changing skill-sets needed by our students. Thus, at both holistic and detailed levels of analysis, CIS faculty attempt to keep abreast of societal and technical changes requiring curricular adjustment. This document is, however, largely concerned with course-level assessment. It depends on direct measures of curricular competence, i.e., student exams, projects and presentations. Because it is an analysis of the artifacts of the curriculum and instructional activity, it is also an indirect assessment exercise. This assessment exercise addresses the fidelity by which the core course set in our CIS major meets a set of stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are represented below. Figure 1 (Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2008) Course-level Assessment method As is typical student performance was measured by sets of direct and indirect measures of exams, homework, projects and presentations, adjudicated by the principal instructor, and in many cases, with the participation of other faculty and industry representatives as outside adjudicators. The course level assessment provided herein was arrived at by indirect means, that is, via the evaluation of static artifacts. Those assessments were based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. For each of the core courses the departmental evaluation committee developed a survey instrument (c.f., http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/index.asp). The draft instrument was created from published course documents and then reviewed by instructional staff to access the efficacy of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of student work, with the provision that there should be a minimal subset of work representing all the stated learning objectives. These materials were made available to the assessment team of faculty, and PhD students. Those evaluating review all documents and the course syllabi and relevant assignment materials then completed the assessment questionnaire. The summary results are reported herein and the overall summary of the graduate assessment may be found at: (To Be Completed for 2006-2007). A fuller description of the assessment process is represented by the diagram above (except figure 1 here) and may be found in Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2008 from which we excerpted this diagram.

**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 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Software Requirements Mgt Student Work (O: 1)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3 average of relevant items assessed for CIS 8030.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3 average of relevant items assessed for CIS 8030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Business innovation requirements student work (O: 1)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6 (Average of all items for CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation survey related to quality of students’ written analysis and proposed system design)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6 (Average of all items for CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation survey related to quality of students’ written analysis and proposed system design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Specs Into systems 8030 student work (O: 2)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.67 average of relevant items assessed for CIS 8030.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.67 average of relevant items assessed for CIS 8030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Translate specifications to programs &amp; systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Network design student work (O: 3)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.38 average.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.38 average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5: Database systems management student work (O: 3)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.38 average.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.38 average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>3.9 average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Manage projects and balance resources</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.29 average of items for which both assessors were able to provide ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology &amp; process</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology &amp; process</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.6 (Average of all items for CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation survey related to quality of students’ written analysis and proposed system design)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Communicate effectively.</th>
<th>4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.0 (Average of item about written communication skills for all MS core courses) (Note that, in all cases, oral communication skills were not observed by the assessors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Analyze and improve network design course**
Analyze and improve network design course

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Network design student work | Outcome/Objective: Create environments for programs and systems
Create better fit with CIS 8000 course project

Create better fit between assessment survey items and course deliverables. The present survey items assume that students work on a project where they employ MS Project (or similar software) to manage an actual IT project. These items were not compatible with one course instructor’s student projects. Hence, the survey items or the assigned project need to be modified to ensure a better fit.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: CIS GPC and Assessment Coordinator

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Computer Science BS

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 B.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Algorithm Design and Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles and methods of analyzing algorithms 2) to analyze complexity of problems and algorithms 3) to formulate optimization problems 4) to apply algorithmic techniques to optimization problems

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
1.4 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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
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
- 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**
- 6.2 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
- 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**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 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: Technology in the Core (CS 1010) (M: 6, 7)**
Students effectively use computers by applying an array of applications or software packages, by using the Internet as a tool, and by developing a simple web page using HTML.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.

**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 assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students worked independently on relevent projects and assignments. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 assement of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. They demonstrated sufficient skill at presentation to be successful in the work force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### Target for O4: Programming Skills
The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
We did not have sufficient data for accurate findings for this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
There is not sufficient data for an accurate assessment of this measure.

**M 6: HTML project (O: 7)**
This project makes use of the HTML programming language in order to create web pages.

**Target for O7: Technology in the Core (CS 1010)**
The average grade for this project should be above 85%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade for the HTML project was 86% over the last academic year. This demonstrates that students have a solid foundation on programming with HTML and are able to develop web pages. The project entails having students insert HTML tables, using different fonts, including headers of various sizes, adding images, active hyperlinks, and active links for e-mailing. Students must follow certain formatting requirements as well. This project covers material learned from using various software packages presented during the course.

**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: Technology in the Core (CS 1010)**
The average grade for all assignments given in CSC 1010 should be above 80%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade for other assignments given in the course besides the project was 84%. This demonstrates that 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

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

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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Alumni Surveys | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis

Implementation Description: December 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Staff person
Additional Resources: We need an alumni database of names and addresses which is accurate, up to date, and comprehensive.

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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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

Implementation Description: May 2008
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:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Algorithm Design and Analysis  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Systems Development  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Discrete Mathematics  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Hardware Systems  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Programming Skills

**Implementation Description:** May 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Staff and department faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Additional staff are required to process the load of distributing, retrieving and collecting the surveys.

**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 evaluating options.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**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:** May 2008  
**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>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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

### SLO 7: Research and Critical Thinking

Students should be able to: 1) study related work and approaches; 2) formulate relevant questions for research; 3) justify and evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses; and 4) provide a theoretical and/or practical (hardware or software) solution to their research problem.

**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
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

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 8: Communication
Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing and oral conventions and formats.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 9: Collaboration
Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Software Systems
Students develop mastery of network-oriented software development, advanced software engineering, computer networks, optical and wireless networks, reconfigurable networks, operating systems, and/or data security.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 11: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
Students should be able to: (a) analyze, correlate and extract information from biological and chemical databases with emphasis on the sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic acids, and (b) apply computational tools, techniques and models to analysis of protein and nucleic acid sequences.

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

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
M.S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.
### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

---

### 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

---

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).

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

---

### 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

**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.
### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

---

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

---

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

---

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of
Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**  
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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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 professionally societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
M.S. students have co-authored many 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*
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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys: | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis

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.

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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys: | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
| Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills

Implementation Description: December 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Staff person

Additional Resources: There is no current reliable database of alumni.

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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys: | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
| Computer Organization and Programming
| Discrete Mathematics
| Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills

Implementation Description: December 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
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**
**2006-2007 Computer Science PhD**
*As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
### 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.

**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.

**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

### SLO 7: Communication

Students communicate effectively using writing and oral conventions and formats appropriate to the research area in computer science.

**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 8: Collaboration

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities appropriate to the research area in computer science.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 9: Research and Critical Thinking

Students should be able to: 1) Achieve understanding of the frontier research literature, emerging technologies, and current research approaches and methods in computer science; 2) Formulate questions for research that are recognized by the broad community computer scientists as advancing knowledge; 3) Justify and evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses to the standards of computer science scholarship; 4) Construct new arguments and formulate new relevant questions based on the results of analysis; and 5) Provide novel theoretical and practical (hardware or software) solutions to formulated problems.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 10: Teaching
Students should be able to teach and/or assist in undergraduate/beginning graduate courses.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 11: Parallel and Distributed Computing**
Students develop mastery of concepts in parallel and distributed computing and/or parallel algorithms.

**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**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 12: Software Engineering**
Students develop mastery of processes and methodologies for developing industrial-strength software systems.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 13: Programming Languages**
Students develop mastery of compiler design, principles of programming languages, and/or deductive databases and logic programming.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 14: Operating Systems**
Students develop mastery of computer networks, optical and wireless networks, reconfigurable networks, operating systems, and/or data security.

**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 15: Theory of Computation**
Students develop mastery of theory of computation and complexity analysis

**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**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 16: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**
Students should be able to: (a) analyze, correlate and extract information from biological and chemical databases with emphasis on the sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic acids, (b) apply computational tools, techniques and models to analysis of protein and nucleic acid sequences, and (c) develop new bioinformatics tools, techniques and models.

**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

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students worked independently on relevant projects and assignments. Additionally they pursued independent work on their dissertation research. The students demonstrated appropriate skill levels and mastery of the subject domains.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
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 (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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).
Professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

**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...
Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students showed faculty level mastery of presentation skills. Several Ph.D. students found tenure track positions that use these skills.

---

**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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

### 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 assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

A total of 13 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated mastery of advanced topics in the appropriate subject domains. The best students had a thorough understanding of advanced topics.

### 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 | **Objective:** Algorithm Design and Analysis
- **Measure:** Computer Organization and Programming | **Objective:** 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 | **Objective:** Algorithm Design and Analysis
- **Measure:** Computer Organization and Programming
- **Measure:** Discrete Mathematics
- **Measure:** Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses | **Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming | Discrete Mathematics
- **Measure:** Examinations | **Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming | Discrete Mathematics
- **Measure:** Graduate Oral and Written Presentations | **Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming | Discrete Mathematics
- **Measure:** Research Publications | **Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming | Discrete Mathematics
- **Measure:** Written Assignments and Reports | **Objective:** Computer Organization and Programming | Discrete Mathematics

**Implementation Description:** December 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

#### 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:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Alumni Surveys | **Objective:** Algorithm Design and Analysis

**Implementation Description:** May 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** Staff person

**Additional Resources:** We need an accurate and reliable source of alumni data to build the database.

#### Consider Foundation Courses at Graduate Level

The curriculum committee is currently evaluating the coursework at the graduate level in order to assess its relevance and currency to the state of the art in computer science.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Ph.D. students who graduated from our program readily found tenure track faculty positions or professional positions in industry. This clearly demonstrates the quality of our program. 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.

**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.

---

**Mission / Purpose**
The overall goal of the concentration in business analysis is to provide the student with specialized training in the use of advanced analytical techniques for managerial decision making. These areas span data analysis, management science, operations management, project management, business intelligence, and decision support systems.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 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.

**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.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score on the four different measures of student capabilities set out above was 4.1, which meets the desired level of student performance.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score on the four different measures of student capabilities set out above was 4.41, which meets the desired level of student performance.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average score on the four different measures of student capabilities set out above was 4.33, which meets the desired level of student performance.

**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

**Availability of Software**

Find sources of affordable software for students to practice advanced analytical techniques.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Application of Statistical Tools | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Capabilities
- Measure: Decision Process Skills | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving Processes
- Measure: Modeling Skills | Outcome/Objective: Modeling Skills

- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members

**Dataset Shortcomings**

Update datasets for courses that focus on analytical techniques to make them more current and relevant.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Application of Statistical Tools | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Capabilities
- Measure: Decision Process Skills | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving Processes
Updating Course Material

All Business Analysis faculty members evaluate their courses on an ongoing basis, as well as the relationships between their courses to ensure that the program is current and comprehensive in this field.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Application of Statistical Tools | **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced Capabilities
- **Measure:** Decision Process Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving Processes
- **Measure:** Modeling Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Modeling Skills

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The Business Analysis concentration for the MBA as well as the MS program have continued to attract students with relatively strong general ability (GMAT scores) and a desire to excel in quantitative analysis. Given this self-selection bias of students in the program, the performances have been consistently above average. Students have demonstrated skills in mapping a business process, identifying improvement opportunities, developing mathematical models in spreadsheets as well as with specialized software like SPSS and SAS, developing Decision Support Systems, and interpreting results for improved decision making. Overall, the quality of student performances in this area has been excellent over the past year.

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

One of the main areas of improvement is access to diverse datasets and software packages for more advanced analytical techniques. Currently, SAS and SPSS do not offer (within the scope of the licenses available at the University) the ability to build Neural Network models, Classification Trees, or Text Data Mining. Availability to students of inexpensive software for these tasks in the future will make the Data Mining course even stronger than it currently is. The courses as designed seem to currently satisfy the needs of the students in the workplace. Feedback received from students indicates that in general they are well-prepared for careers in this area after completion of the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:03 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.

**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.

**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.
**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.

**SLO 5: Skill Demonstration**

Prior to graduation students must demonstrate the ability to apply their knowledge and skills in entrepreneurship to real business situations.

**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.

**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.

**O/O 8: 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: 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.

- **Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Not Met
  
  There are no findings in this AY.

**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

**Development of Entrepreneurship Measures**

The new Director of the Russell Center for Entrepreneurship will develop measures and an implementation plan for the Assessment
of the Entrepreneurship concentration of the MBA program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Entrepreneurship Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
There was no assessment conducted in the 2006-2007 AY.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There was no assessment conducted in the 2006-2007 AY.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Pretest scores (average 36.2) and posttest scores (average 79.3) indicated that outcomes were met, but safety (under OSHA) and other HR laws were weak areas in the SHRM certification examination (failed by 1 student with low scores by 1 student). Labor issues was also cited by 28% of graduates as being inadequately covered in class.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

SHRM certification results indicated weakness in understanding of the Sherman Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Faculty ratings of performance in class were 2.9/5.0. Employment law was cited by 17% of students as being inadequately covered or needing improvement.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Although those students who had taken MGS 8395 were pleased with the course and both faculty and clients rated the projects well (average 95/100), almost no MBA students take MGS 8395. Not all instructors in MGS 8300 and 8360 require research projects, so there is inconsistency in the amount and quality of HR research students are exposed to.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Faculty ratings of student performance averaged 2.8/5.0 and 11% of graduates felt benefits were inadequately covered in their classes. Analysis revealed only about half of MBA/HRM students take 8390 and that it is perceived as a “difficult” course mainly for those wishing to practice in compensation. Pretest scores averaged 35.6 and posttest scores averaged 92.1, indicating the MGS course is meeting learning objectives.

**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

**Application to Practice**

Incorporate a short research assignment in MGS 8300 and 8390 and grade based on criteria in the learning outcome. Continue to seek and use actual client projects not only in MGS 8395 but in 8300, 8320, 8360, and 8390.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Knowledge and Application Ability Level | Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Changes in MGS 8300 and MGS 8360
Incorporate at least one research paper in MGS 8300 and 8360.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Translation of Skills to Business | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking and Analysis

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Changes in MGS 8320 and MGS 8390
Incorporate 2 required application cases in MGS 8320 and 2 additional cases in MGS 8390 to stress student application of laws to real-world settings.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Level of Compensation Skills | Outcome/Objective: Compensation Comprehension

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Emphasis on Benefits Management
Form a committee to investigate making MGS 8390 required for MBA/HRM students. Add 3 hours of class time to coverage of benefits and add a required benefits module for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Level of Compensation Skills | Outcome/Objective: Compensation Comprehension

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Emphasis on Recruiting and Selection
Appoint a full-time faculty member to be coordinator of MGS 8360 to ensure that all topics are adequately covered in this course. Incorporate 3 additional hours of in-class experiential work in MGS 8360, especially in interviewing skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Knowledge and Application Ability Level | Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Expanded Legal Coverage
Incorporate 5 additional hours of class time to coverage of Sherman Act and OSHA in MGS 8300 and include more content in exams.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Knowledge and Application Ability Level | Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
There were strong points on each of the topics that the HR MBA Concentration wishes to emphasize, however there was no area that was clearly a strength without need for improvement.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Each area showed needs for improvement. The breadth of acquisition of knowledge was a general concern, particularly in areas that have focused relevance to Human resource Management. In some cases elective classes that are thought to be important have low
enrollments that may reflect students’ failure to appreciate the importance of the subject matter.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Concentration in Operations Management MBA**

*(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.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target:**

Student performance on the Reasoned Analysis items average 1.7 on the Likert-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.6.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met

Student performance on the Integration of recommendations items average 1.85 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.8.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met

Student performance on the Performanceitems average 1.8 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.6.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met

Student performance on the Team Skills items average 1.9 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the two components were lower than 1.8.

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: Reasoned 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: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

Implementation Description: AY 2007
Responsible Person/Group: OM Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

Change Assessment Measures
Individual assessment Measures need to be broken out from the current multi-item Measures in use to allow individual analysis in findings and to further focus the action plan.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Employment

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Change in Assessment Venue
Change the assessment of the electives to include only MGS 8770 and MGS 8710. Both MGS 8760 and MGS 8740 do not consistently have a major project.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Increase Emphasis on HR in Opps Mgt
Increase the emphasis on the importance of the HR functions to the area of Operations Management. This will be done both in the elective classes and the core MBA class.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Increased Emphasis on Quantitative Analysis
In both the electives and core courses, there will be an increase in the emphasis placed on the importance of the quantitative problem solving and the large number of possible applications of those techniques.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation
  Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Evaluation

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The students continue to show general strength in their ability to develop the structure of an organization from a macro point of view.
They also have the ability to position the operations management function into the overall firm's competitive strategy. This is indicative of students who have job experience that required them to work within an organization. They are then capable of bringing that experience back into the classroom as evidenced in their project work. The students were able to apply analytical techniques to their chosen project's topic, particularly qualitative analytical techniques. The students understand the importance of performance implications of their firm's actions as they relate to operations management, and were able to relate them to both specific firms and industry.

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

Further emphasis needs to be placed on both integrating the human resources function into the operations area and increasing the emphasis on the importance of human resources to the operations management area. There needs to be an increase in the emphasis on being innovative when applying quantitative techniques to operations management and supply chain problems.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2006-2007 Concentration in Organization Management MBA**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

None to date

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Mgt. (M: 2)**

Students will be offered a wide variety of classes that enhance their managerial skills in the following areas: research, case analysis, critical thinking, writing, problem solving, analysis, oral presentation, and technology. Students and Faculty should note an improvement in skills.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Managerial Skill Set (M: 2)**

The ability to improve skills related to managing organizations is an important part of this concentration. Students will be offered a wide variety of classes that enhance their managerial skills by asking them to work in teams, complete case analyses, and make oral presentations.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Development of MBA Assessment (M: 1)**

To complete the development of an MBA Concentration Assessment plan distinctive from the one for the MS program and including Measures to be used.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Student Assessment of Performance (O: 1)**

Students were asked if their elective courses in this concentration enhanced various skill sets using a Yes, No, Not Sure format. In the courses you have taken for the Organization Management Concentration, the following statements either do or do not apply. Please choose the best answer. I have enhanced my research skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my case analysis skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my critical thinking skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my writing skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my problem solving skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my analysis skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my oral presentation skills Yes No Not Sure I have enhanced my technology skills Yes No Not Sure

**Target for O1: Development of MBA Assessment**

We are expecting strong performance on the evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 70% endorsement of YES answers to the above questions.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

I have enhanced my research skills Yes 30%; I have enhanced my case analysis skills Yes 50%; I have enhanced my critical
thinking skills
Yes 70%; I have enhanced my writing skills
Yes 60%; I have enhanced my problem solving skills
Yes 80%; I have enhanced my analysis skills
Yes 80%; I have enhanced my oral presentation skills
Yes 40%; I have enhanced my technology
skills Yes (20%).

M 2: Faculty Assessment of Proficiency (O: 2, 3)
Faculty members were asked to identify the course in the concentration they taught, the best measure of student learning, and the %
of students who were exemplary, proficient, and unacceptable at this task. Faculty members were also asked what a future goal
would be for their course.

Target for O2: Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Mgt.
Having 80% of the students at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each course is desired.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Of the twelve student skills assessed in twelve different courses 9 were found to have met the criteria. Two clearly did not,
Negotiation and Business Plan. A third item. Individual Analysis was right at 80%

Target for O3: Managerial Skill Set
Having 80% of the students at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each course is desired.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Of the twelve student skills assessed in twelve different courses 9 were found to have met the criteria. Two clearly did not,
Negotiation and Business Plan. A third item. Individual Analysis was right at 80%

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

Choosing one course as a required course
Within this concentration there needs to be at least one common course. This course could serve as the vehicle for all assessment
and skill based testing.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Student Assessment of Performance | Outcome/Objective: Development of MBA Assessment
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Organizational Behavior Faculty Members

Establishing a uniform assessment document
There are several places where assessment could be enhanced in each elective course by establishing a uniform assessment
document.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Assessment of Proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Mgt.
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Organizational Behavior Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
outcomes/objectives?
Students are taking a wide variety of classes within this concentration and we are attracting a healthy number of MBAs to this
concentration. Faculty see students as proficient or exemplary in a large percentage of the skills covered by Measure 2.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued
attention?
There are some areas where students need better skill levels than are currently being produced. These need be targeted in the
courses where the skills are introduced, as well as targeting reinforcement in other classes. Related to the both the strengths and
areas of attention, improvement in the assessment measurement tool is critical. Primary trait analysis rubrics are not used and need
to be developed for each of the instructor assessments for skills.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Counseling Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 and advocacy. Students are prepared to generate and apply psychological knowledge to human development, adaptation, and adjustment issues. Note: Our program has 34 students and had 2 students graduate with the Ph.D. degree during this assessment cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 5: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients (M: 10, 11)
Prepared to work with clients who are culturally and individually different.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain D

Other 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 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: 4)
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 O4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All practicum students received satisfactory ratings 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
100% passing grades in theories coursework

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students obtained passing grades in theories courses.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Understands relevant theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% passing grades on theory comprehensive examination question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Five students took comprehensive exams this year and all passed the theory question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: grades in Ethics course (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades in Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students obtained passing grade in ethics course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Grades in research courses (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades in research courses about research methods (e.g., EPRS 8530, EPRS 8540, EPRS 9820, CPS 9930).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students met target performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Research comprehensive examination question (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Five students took comprehensive exam this year and all passed the research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Comprehensive examination question on ethics (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Five students took comprehensive exam this year and all passed the ethics question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: grades in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades in didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students received passing grades in didactic courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 3)</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All practicum students received satisfactory evaluation from their supervisors on categories relating to professional ethics.

| M 10: grades in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course (O: 5) |
grades in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course (i.e., CPS 8340)

**Target for O5: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**
100% passing grades in Advanced Multicultural course

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students obtained passing grade in multicultural counseling course.

**M 11: evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 5)**
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.

**Target for O5: Effectiveness 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All practicum students received satisfactory ratings from their supervisors on counseling multicultural clients.

---

### 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

#### Maintain and Monitor Program Effectiveness
To maintain and monitor student learning outcomes so that all learning objectives will continue to be met.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
  **Implementation Status:** Planned  
  **Priority:** High  
  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
    - **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on ethics  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice  
    - **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on theory  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Understands relevant theories  
    - **Measure:** evaluation by practicum supervisor  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients  
    - **Measure:** grades in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment)  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Is proficient in key areas of the profession  
    - **Measure:** Grades in Ethics course  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice  
    - **Measure:** Grades in research courses  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Use and conduct research  
    - **Measure:** Grades in theories courses  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Understands relevant theories  
    - **Measure:** Research comprehensive examination question  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Use and conduct research  
    - **Measure:** written practicum evaluation from supervisors  
      **Outcome/Objective:** Is proficient in key areas of the profession

  **Implementation Description:** On-going  
  **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 applicants for internship were matched with a placement this year.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
None.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2006-2007 Counselor Education PhD**
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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)**

Students will be prepared to teach in University settings.

Relevant Associations: This objective is consistent with the following standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): Standard 2.D.2 It is expected that doctoral students will have experiences that are designed to: develop collaborative relationships with program faculty in teaching, supervision, research, professional writing, and service to the profession and the public.

**O/O 2: Use and conduct research (M: 2)**

Students will be prepared to use and conduct research.

Relevant Associations: This objective is consistent with the following standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): Section 2.C-Learning experiences beyond the entry-level are required in all of the following content: 5. design and implementation of quantitative research and methodology, including univariate, multivariate, and single-subject design; 6. design and implementation of qualitative research, including grounded theory, ethnographic, and phenomenological methodologies; 7. models and methods of assessment and use of data; Section 2.D-It is expected that doctoral students will have experiences that are designed to: 5. promote scholarly counseling research; and 6. enhance technical competence.

**O/O 3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice (M: 4)**

Students will be knowledgeable about the tenets of multicultural and ethical practice with a diverse clientele in various settings.

Relevant Associations: This objective is consistent with the following standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): Section 2-C. Learning experiences beyond the entry-level are required in all of the following content: 9. the role of racial, ethnic, and cultural heritage, nationality, socioeconomic status, family structure, age, gender, sexual orientation, religious and spiritual beliefs, occupation, physical, and mental status, local, regional, national, international perspective, and equity issues in counselor education programs;

**O/O 4: Prepared to provide supervision (M: 3)**

Students will be prepared to provide supervision.

Relevant Associations: This objective is consistent with the following standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): Section 2-C. Learning experiences beyond the entry-level are required in all of the following content areas: 2. theories and practices of counselor supervision; 8. ethical and legal considerations in counselor education and supervision.

**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 professional portfolio 2. 100% passing grades (B or better) in instructing adults course 3. Mentor assesses the competency level of the student via observations and ability of student to use feedback.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

1. Students received a 100% passing on their professional portfolio. 2. Students received 100% passing grade in instructing adult course. 3. Mentors assessed that students competently demonstrated teaching skills via observations and ability of students 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 2006-2007 - 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: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

1. Students received 100% passing grade in the counseling supervision course. 2. Students demonstrated competence in supervision as assessed by their practicum supervisor using taped supervision sessions and case presentation of supervision.

M 4: Competent in professional & multicultural issues. (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. 3. 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

1. Students received 100% passing grade in the various courses. 2. Students successfully completed their practicum/internship experience. 3. 100% pass rate on the written comprehensive examination.

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: Research competence | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research

Implementation Description: Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty

Maintain current design; monitor student progress
The CEP program will maintain the current design and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes and objectives during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 & multicultural issues. | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice
- Measure: Research competence | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research

Implementation Description: Ongoing for 2007-2008 academic year.
Responsible Person/Group: CEP Program Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
CEP students successfully met the outcomes/objectives.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The CEP Faculty will continue to monitor the outcomes/objectives.
**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 (M: 2)**

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**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the M.A. program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Associate Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No finding this year.

**Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the M.A. program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Associate Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No finding this year.

**Target for O3: Craftsmanship**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the M.A. program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Associate Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No finding this year.

**Target for O4: Revising Skills**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the M.A. program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Associate Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No finding this year.

**M 2: Using teaching portfolios to assess teaching (O: 5)**

It has been a long established policy for the Director of Lower Division Studies to assess teaching done by Graduate Teaching Assistants. Teaching Assistants in English are Instructors of record, so it is imperative that their success in the classroom be monitored and encouraged. Teaching Assistants are required to submit a teaching portfolio each spring that includes the teacher’s c.v., a teaching philosophy, a reflection on each course taught, class syllabi, a learning outcome analysis for each class taught, "formative evalu"
Director of Lower Division and her Associate Director write extensive responses to the teaching portfolio, focusing on aspects that TAs will likely use in their future academic situations - like the teaching philosophy. Responses include suggestions as well as basic overall responses. Teaching Conferences are 2-day conferences with concurrent sessions about teaching and professional development. TAs lead most of the sessions, sharing ideas and questions in round table fashion. However, each semester English faculty are invited to participate, and do. TAs report that they enjoy these conferences for their information, but also for the community they develop among TAs and faculty at the beginning of each semester. The teaching portfolio requests a reflection concerning the Professional Development Communities as well. Through these reflections, the Director learns about TA attitudes and involvement in this part of the training program. Several TAs indicated that the way their Professional Community was designed was not effective or informative for them (24%). Another 52% responded that their community was extremely helpful and that they would continue to meet together in the following year. The rest reported that they thought the communities were "ok". Communities that have consistent faculty mentoring/facilitation are the communities that respond most favorably. Finally, the Student Evaluations indicate that the average score on Question 17 over the whole year was 4.42 with a range from 2 to 5. Two hundred-seventy-two classes and 85 TAs are included in this average.

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):
  Measure: M.F.A. Thesis
  Outcome/Objective: Application of Literary Studies
  | Content Knowledge | Craftsmanship | Revising Skills

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):
  Measure: M.F.A. Thesis
  Outcome/Objective: Application of Literary Studies
  | Content Knowledge | Craftsmanship | Revising Skills

Implementation Description: August 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Tanya Caldwell, Associate Graduate Director

Continue teaching assessment
The evaluation of graduate teaching assistants is an extremely important part of overseeing the teaching of the introductory English courses. This process will continue in 2007-2008, but this year with a fuller sense of how this evaluation work ties in to students’ achievement of the graduate learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Lower Division Studies

Initiate thesis assessment
All M.A. theses that are completed during 2006-2007 will be assessed for their level of proficiency, in terms of the graduate learning outcomes. Faculty members of a thesis committee will jointly complete a thesis assessment form that uses a six-point scale.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing and theses committees

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
While no statistical assessment data was generated on the Creative Writing MFA this year because the thesis assessment process was delayed until next year, the director of Creative Writing was able to cite ample evidence of students’ success in this program. Creative Writing graduate students published poetry or fiction in six literary journals, one student published a collection of poetry while another published a novel, and two students won literary contests. A detailed list of these noteworthy successes can be found at http://workshop.gsu.edu/news.html.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
It is critical to initiate the thesis assessment process by next year so that data on the learning outcomes can be gathered for students in this concentration.
### 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: As of Spring Semester 2007, our program had 445 majors. 95 students graduated with a BS degree during this assessment cycle.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 2: Apply social science approach to study crime (M: 2)

Students will apply the social science approach to the study of crime and justice in society, which takes into consideration the academic contributions 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>
<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>
<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>

#### SLO 3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8)

Students will develop an understanding of the criminal justice, which is demonstrated through discussions and written assessments of the evolution and current operations of the system’s principal components (public safety, judiciary, corrections, and juvenile justice).

<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>
<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>

#### SLO 4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)

Students will assess 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>
<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>
</table>
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Evaluate the role of crime in society (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will identify and apply relevant criminological theories when evaluating the role that crime plays in society today.

**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
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Develop skills to promote career advancement (M: 1, 10)**

Graduates of this program will possess and display the skills necessary to continue in higher education and/or commence employment in a criminal justice career.

Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9

**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**

- 1.2 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: Demonstrate critical reading skills (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to read critically by reading and expounding on diverse literature that is related to the discipline.

Relevant Associations: Note: Criminal Justice and Criminology Programs have no accrediting agency that dictates curriculum and other academic requirements. The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) has developed voluntary certification standards that are harmonious with general accreditation requirements and that provide guidance to Criminal Justice and Criminology programs. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Certification Standards for College/University Criminal Justice Baccalaureate Degree Programs, Standard B.9 (hereinafter ACJS Certification Standard B.9): The purpose of undergraduate programs in criminal justice is to educate students to be critical thinkers who can communicate their thoughts effectively in oral and written form. Programs should familiarize students with facts and concepts and teach students to apply knowledge to related problems and changing situations. Primary objectives of all criminal justice programs include development of critical thinking; communication, technology, and computing skills; quantitative reasoning; ethical decision-making; and understanding of diversity.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 8 Critical Thinking--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 8: Apply scientific reasoning skills (M: 2)**

Students will apply scientific reasoning skills to the study of crime and justice.

Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9

**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
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Analyze Contemporary Issues (M: 7)**

Students will analyze contemporary, multicultural, global, and international issues impacting crime and justice utilizing a social science perspective.

Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

8 Critical Thinking--core
10 Contemporary Issues--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 10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively (M: 2, 4, 5, 8)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and effectively in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.


**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--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 11: Demonstrate the ability to speak effectively (M: 8)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to speak effectively in a public setting on diverse issues related to crime and justice.


**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major
4 Oral Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--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 12: Demonstrate critical thinking skills (M: 2, 4, 5, 8)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically and will provide evidence of this skill through written and oral communications.


**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
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 13: Use of technology (M: 9)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively use various forms of technology including (but not limited to) computers, word processing software, internet resources, email, WebCT/Vista, and statistical software (SPSS).

Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 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

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: 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: Field placement experience (O: 3, 4, 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 O3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system**
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation and will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The Department has established relationships with over 100 agencies including state and local law enforcement agencies, courts, corrections, and private law firms that serve as field placement sites for criminal justice students. During the current period of assessment 95 students completed the field placement experience prior to graduation: 31 in Fall 2006; 33 in Spring 2007; and 31 in Summer 2007. Agency evaluations were completed on 44 students (46%) and returned to the Department’s Internship Coordinator. On the question of academic preparedness and skill level prior to the internship, 98% of the students for whom agency evaluations were received scored 3 (average) or higher on a 5-point scale; 44% were rated as excellent. Similarly, on the question of the student’s ability to perform the major duties of the internship, 100% of the students were rated 3 or higher, and 66% were rated as excellent.

**Target for O4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice**
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation and will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The Department has established relationships with over 100 agencies including state and local law enforcement agencies, courts, corrections, and private law firms that serve as field placement sites for criminal justice students. During the current period of assessment 95 students completed the field placement experience prior to graduation: 31 in Fall 2006; 33 in Spring 2007; and 31 in Summer 2007. Agency evaluations were completed on 44 students (46%) and returned to the Department’s Internship Coordinator. On the question of academic preparedness and skill level prior to the internship, 98% of the students for whom agency evaluations were received scored 3 (average) or higher on a 5-point scale; 44% were rated as excellent. Similarly, on the question of the student’s ability to perform the major duties of the internship, 100% of the students were rated 3 or higher, and 66% were rated as excellent.

**Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society**
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation and will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The Department has established relationships with over 100 agencies including state and local law enforcement agencies, courts, corrections, and private law firms that serve as field placement sites for criminal justice students. During the current period of assessment 95 students completed the field placement experience prior to graduation: 31 in Fall 2006; 33 in Spring 2007; and 31 in Summer 2007. Agency evaluations were completed on 44 students (46%) and returned to the Department’s Internship Coordinator. On the question of academic preparedness and skill level prior to the internship, 98% of the students for whom agency evaluations were received scored 3 (average) or higher on a 5-point scale; 44% were rated as excellent. Similarly, on the question of the student’s ability to perform the major duties of the internship, 100% of the students were rated 3 or higher, and 66% were rated as excellent.

**Target for O6: Develop skills to promote career advancement**
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation and will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Department has established relationships with over 100 agencies including state and local law enforcement agencies, courts, corrections, and private law firms that serve as field placement sites for criminal justice students. During the current period of assessment 95 students completed the field placement experience prior to graduation: 31 in Fall 2006; 33 in Spring 2007; and 31 in Summer 2007. Agency evaluations were completed on 44 students (46%) and returned to the Department’s Internship Coordinator. On the question of academic preparedness and skill level prior to the internship, 98% of the students for whom agency evaluations were received scored 3 (average) or higher on a 5-point scale; 44% were rated as excellent. Similarly, on the question of the student’s ability to perform the major duties of the internship, 100% of the students were rated 3 or higher, and 66% were rated as excellent.

Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading skills
100% of students will complete a criminal justice field placement prior to graduation and will receive an agency evaluation of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Department has established relationships with over 100 agencies including state and local law enforcement agencies, courts, corrections, and private law firms that serve as field placement sites for criminal justice students. During the current period of assessment 95 students completed the field placement experience prior to graduation: 31 in Fall 2006; 33 in Spring 2007; and 31 in Summer 2007. Agency evaluations were completed on 44 students (46%) and returned to the Department’s Internship Coordinator. On the question of academic preparedness and skill level prior to the internship, 98% of the students for whom agency evaluations were received scored 3 (average) or higher on a 5-point scale; 44% were rated as excellent. Similarly, on the question of the student’s ability to perform the major duties of the internship, 100% of the students were rated 3 or higher, and 66% were rated as excellent.

M 2: Writing intensive courses (O: 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12)
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.

Target for O2: Apply social science approach to study crime
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

Target for O3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading skills
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

Target for O8: Apply scientific reasoning skills
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

Target for O12: Demonstrate critical thinking skills
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 75% of the students in CrJu 3020 and CrJu 4930 completed the course with a grade of 70% or better.

M 3: Analysis of curriculum and syllabi (O: 1)
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.
Target for O1: Outcome/Objective Not Specified

100% of faculty will report that all classes taught reflect relevant and recent developments in the field.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The Undergraduate Committee evaluated the syllabi for 10 courses in Areas E, F, G, H, and I: CrJu 2200; CrJu 1100; CrJu 3110; CrJu 3310; CrJu 3410; CrJu 3700; CrJu 3020; CrJu 3610; CrJu 3710; and CrJu 4760. 100% of the syllabi reflect that the subject matter taught by faculty is relevant and includes recent developments in the field of criminology and criminal justice. The Undergraduate Committee engaged in internal discussions and began to collect informal feedback from the Criminal Justice Student Association regarding the students’ perceptions of the currency and relevancy of the existing criminal justice curriculum. The Committee will continue to evaluate this matter in the 2007/2008 academic year.

M 4: Capstone portfolio (O: 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12)

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The Undergraduate Committee evaluated the syllabi for 10 courses in Areas E, F, G, H, and I: CrJu 2200; CrJu 1100; CrJu 3110; CrJu 3310; CrJu 3410; CrJu 3700; CrJu 3020; CrJu 3610; CrJu 3710; and CrJu 4760. 100% of the syllabi reflect that the subject matter taught by faculty is relevant and includes recent developments in the field of criminology and criminal justice. The Undergraduate Committee engaged in internal discussions and began to collect informal feedback from the Criminal Justice Student Association regarding the students’ perceptions of the currency and relevancy of the existing criminal justice curriculum. The Committee will continue to evaluate this matter in the 2007/2008 academic year.

Target for O3: Demonstrate understanding of the 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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

Target for O4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice

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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society

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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading 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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively

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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

Target for O12: Demonstrate critical thinking 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 rating of 70% or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The portfolios of all students (N=19) in one section of Dr. Dean Dabney’s CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 courses were assessed during the Spring 2007 semester. This constituted 20% of all seniors graduating during the annual assessment period. 100% of the students’ portfolios received a satisfactory rating of 70% or better.

M 5: Capstone papers (O: 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12)

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.
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 O3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**Target for O4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading skills**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**Target for O12: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each essay in the capstone series.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The capstone papers were evaluated by Dr. Dabney during the Spring 2007 semester as a component of the capstone portfolio. 100% of the students received a score of 70% or higher on each essay. The average scores were as follows: Descriptive Essay 87%; Single Issue Essay 88%; Theoretical Essay 88%; Pro/Con Essay 83%; and Critical Assessment Essay 83%.

**M 6: Capstone examination (O: 3, 4, 5)**

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 O3: Demonstrate understanding of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Data collection for this assessment period occurred across three semesters: Fall 2006, Summer 2006, and Spring 2007. Analysis revealed that 91.5% of the 106 students who took the exam scored 70% or better on the first attempt with a mean score of 74.5%. Eight percent (8%) of students taking the exam scored between 58% and 68%.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data collection for this assessment period occurred across three semesters: Fall 2006, Summer 2006, and Spring 2007. Analysis revealed that 91.5% of the 106 students who took the exam scored 70% or better on the first attempt with a mean score of 74.5%. Eight percent (8%) of students taking the exam scored between 58% and 68%.

### Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data collection for this assessment period occurred across three semesters: Fall 2006, Summer 2006, and Spring 2007. Analysis revealed that 91.5% of the 106 students who took the exam scored 70% or better on the first attempt with a mean score of 74.5%. Eight percent (8%) of students taking the exam scored between 58% and 68%.

### M 7: Contemporary Issues exam questions (O: 9)

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 O9: Analyze Contemporary Issues

For the 2005-2006 assessment cycle the target performance level was to have at least 60% of students answer 60% of the embedded questions correctly. This target was reconsidered and determined to be too low. The revised target performance level for 2006-2007 is to have at least 70% of students answer 70% of the embedded questions correctly.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2 the pass rate was 79% and 88% respectively. Regarding Goal IV.2.a, question 1, the pass rate was 94% while the pass rate for question 2 was 88%. For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2, the pass rate was 74% and 72% respectively. In Ms. Atala’s course, regarding Goal IV.1, questions 1 and 2, the pass rate was 94% and 90% respectively. Regarding Goal IV.2.a, question 1, the pass rate was 94% while the pass rate for question 2 was 92%. For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2 the pass rate was 79% and 88% respectively.

### M 8: Oral Progress Reports (O: 3, 10, 11, 12)

Each student will present three oral progress reports during the semester, which relate information from extant criminal justice literature to the intern’s agency experience. One presentation will be developed in PowerPoint format to ensure familiarity with the technology.

### Target for O3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940. Each student presented three oral progress reports, one of which was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. 100% of the students received a score on the progress reports of 70% or better. The average score for report #1 was 93%; report #2 was 94%; and report #3 was 95%. The Power Point presentation was not graded but was reviewed to ensure the students’ competency with the technology.

### Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940. Each student presented three oral progress reports, one of which was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. 100% of the students received a score on the progress reports of 70% or better. The average score for report #1 was 93%; report #2 was 94%; and report #3 was 95%. The Power Point presentation was not graded but was reviewed to ensure the students’ competency with the technology.

### Target for O11: Demonstrate the ability to speak effectively

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930

---

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data collection for this assessment period occurred across three semesters: Fall 2006, Summer 2006, and Spring 2007. Analysis revealed that 91.5% of the 106 students who took the exam scored 70% or better on the first attempt with a mean score of 74.5%. Eight percent (8%) of students taking the exam scored between 58% and 68%.

### Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data collection for this assessment period occurred across three semesters: Fall 2006, Summer 2006, and Spring 2007. Analysis revealed that 91.5% of the 106 students who took the exam scored 70% or better on the first attempt with a mean score of 74.5%. Eight percent (8%) of students taking the exam scored between 58% and 68%.

### M 7: Contemporary Issues exam questions (O: 9)

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 O9: Analyze Contemporary Issues

For the 2005-2006 assessment cycle the target performance level was to have at least 60% of students answer 60% of the embedded questions correctly. This target was reconsidered and determined to be too low. The revised target performance level for 2006-2007 is to have at least 70% of students answer 70% of the embedded questions correctly.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2 the pass rate was 79% and 88% respectively. Regarding Goal IV.2.a, question 1, the pass rate was 94% while the pass rate for question 2 was 88%. For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2, the pass rate was 74% and 72% respectively. In Ms. Atala’s course, regarding Goal IV.1, questions 1 and 2, the pass rate was 94% and 90% respectively. Regarding Goal IV.2.a, question 1, the pass rate was 94% while the pass rate for question 2 was 92%. For Goal IV.2.b, questions 1 and 2 the pass rate was 79% and 88% respectively.

### M 8: Oral Progress Reports (O: 3, 10, 11, 12)

Each student will present three oral progress reports during the semester, which relate information from extant criminal justice literature to the intern’s agency experience. One presentation will be developed in PowerPoint format to ensure familiarity with the technology.

### Target for O3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940. Each student presented three oral progress reports, one of which was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. 100% of the students received a score on the progress reports of 70% or better. The average score for report #1 was 93%; report #2 was 94%; and report #3 was 95%. The Power Point presentation was not graded but was reviewed to ensure the students’ competency with the technology.

### Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940. Each student presented three oral progress reports, one of which was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. 100% of the students received a score on the progress reports of 70% or better. The average score for report #1 was 93%; report #2 was 94%; and report #3 was 95%. The Power Point presentation was not graded but was reviewed to ensure the students’ competency with the technology.

### Target for O11: Demonstrate the ability to speak effectively

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930
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.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Administer Program Assessment Survey
Administer Undergraduate Program Assessment Survey to evaluate the curricular success and job readiness of graduating seniors.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Data on the oral presentations were collected and evaluated during the Spring 2007 semester by Dr. Dabney in CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940. Each student presented three oral progress reports, one of which was accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. 100% of the students received a score on the progress reports of 70% or better. The average score for report #1 was 93%; report #2 was 94%; and report #3 was 95%. The Power Point presentation was not graded but was reviewed to ensure the students’ competency with the technology.

M 9: Technological Skills (O: 13)
During the process of completing their major criminal justice students will take a variety of classes requiring them to use technology in diverse forms. Indicative of this, CrJu 3020 requires students to use internet resources to conduct research, to use SPSS to analyze data, and to write a social science research proposal. CrJu 4930 requires students to use internet resources to conduct research and to develop and present a PowerPoint presentation. Other courses that are web-enhanced (e.g., CrJu 3110, CrJu 3710, and CrJu 4940) require students to display competency in using WebCT/Vista. In virtually every class students use email a primary means of communicating with the instructor.

Target for O12: Demonstrate critical thinking skills
100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940 require each interning student to use computers and word processing software to write papers and upload assignments to WebCT/Vista, and to communicate electronically with the professor. Students also are required to complete a PowerPoint presentation as a requirement for graduation. The presentations are not graded; however, students receive feedback on their work. With the exception of PowerPoint presentations, no data has been collected on the level of student competencies regarding the use of modern technology. Anecdotal evidence suggests that most students have little difficulty in this area and are able to complete assignments requiring them to use various technologies and online resources.

M 10: Alumni Survey (O: 6)
Recent Criminal Justice alumni will be surveyed regarding the perceived value of their major in facilitating the achievement of job placement, career aspirations, and other personal and professional goals.

Target for O6: Develop skills to promote career advancement
The Department will begin to gather baseline data from criminal justice majors by evaluating information obtained annually by the Office of Institutional Research in the Exit Survey of Recipients of Undergraduate degrees. An independent survey also will be administered to criminal justice alumni who have been separated from the University for three years beginning in 2008, in conjunction with the next departmental self study which will take place in 2008-2009.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
In 2002 the Department surveyed criminal justice majors and alumni in conjunction with a self study and concluded that a majority valued their major, were quite satisfied with their choice, and would recommend the Department to others. During the current assessment period, the Department’s Undergraduate Committee analyzed the Office of Institutional Research’s Fall 2004-Summer 2006 Exit Survey Results and concluded that recent Criminal Justice graduates accord an overall rating of good (3) to excellent (4) to the quality of required courses in the program (mean 3.52) and the quality of instruction (mean 3.47). More than 80% of students surveyed indicated that the academic program had prepared them for advanced study (86%) and provided them with good preparation for their career choice (82%). 86% of recent graduates surveyed also stated that they would recommend the program to a friend. The Undergraduate Committee is in the discussion and planning stages of developing a survey instrument to be administered to alumni who have been separated from the University for three years. It is still anticipated that the instrument will be constructed and administered in Fiscal Year 2007/2008 in conjunction with the impending self study.
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.

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.

Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of program
Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program and provide recommendations for improvements.

Reevaluate capstone examination
Reevaluate capstone examination to ensure that the content of the examination reflects the substantive information taught in the criminal justice curriculum.

Review all learning outcomes
Review syllabi and curriculums to ensure that all basic learning outcomes are relevant, measurable and achievable.

Administer Alumni Survey
The data on Criminal Justice alumni that were used for this assessment were obtained from the University entrance and exit surveys for the period 2004 through 2006. These surveys asked generic questions related to students’ perceptions of their competencies regarding the GSU student learning outcomes and the quality of the criminal justice program; however, they failed to address the following issues: 1) to identify the students’ career goals at the point of entry and exit; 2) to identify the types of jobs students obtain on completion of the degree program; and 3) to identify which students continue on in higher education. Answers to these and related questions will provide valuable information that is needed to facilitate program development and to ensure the implementation of appropriate curricular benchmarks for student success.

Conduct a curriculum assessment
The Undergraduate Committee will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice curriculum and make recommendations for improvement.
Develop and maintain a strategic plan

The Department will develop, implement, maintain, and monitor a strategic plan to ensure the provision of quality undergraduate education to criminal justice majors. An annual assessment of goal attainment will be made.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement

Implementation Description: 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Develop assessment rubrics and protocols

Assessment rubrics and protocols are needed to ensure fair and consistent grading across students, assignments, and courses. They also serve as teaching tools to clearly apprise students of the criteria for achieving excellence in the criminal justice program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Field placement experience | Outcome/Objective: Assess the role of law in criminal justice
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement

Implementation Description: Complete draft of strategic plan by March 2008.
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Establish benchmarks for curricular success

The Department will establish and maintain benchmarks for undergraduate curricular success including the number and quality of Criminal Justice majors, recruitment and retention measures, and higher education and career placement trends. Implementation of this action step will be undertaken simultaneously with development of the strategic plan.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Oral Progress Reports | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate critical reading skills
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement

Implementation Description: Complete draft by March 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and Criminal Justice Faculty

Review syllabi and revise learning outcomes

The Criminal Justice faculty will continue to review and revise course syllabi as is appropriate, taking into consideration the need to include clear and measurable student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Criminal Justice students continue to do well on outcomes related to critical reading, writing, thinking, and communication. The capstone courses (CrJu 4930 and CrJu 4940) provide an excellent opportunity for graduating seniors to integrate and apply these skills in a professional setting. To enhance student development the Department is aggressively implementing the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) by exposing students to a range of diverse but rigorous critical thinking and writing activities in these
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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 responses 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.

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.

Institutional Priority Associations

1. 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.

**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.
**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.

**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.

**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.

**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 (on a 5-point scale) for each of the six student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Consequently, no comparison of findings is warranted at this time.

**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**  
No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**  
The graduate coordinator for the master’s degree program has compiled preliminary questions for the alumni survey. There are no specific findings to report at this time. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**  
No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**  
The graduate coordinator for the master’s degree program has compiled preliminary questions for the alumni survey. There are no specific findings to report at this time. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Target for O3: Apply Terminology and Theory**  
No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**  
The graduate coordinator for the master’s degree program has compiled preliminary questions for the alumni survey. There are no specific findings to report at this time. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Target for O4: Communicate Effectively**  
No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Target for O5: Understand Integration of Systems and Processes

No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

Target for O6: Apply Research and Statistical Skills

No target performance levels have been set for the different areas since the survey has not been finalized and piloted. More detailed information about the progress of this project is reported in the Action Plan.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. Therefore, two significant distinctions in the target level performance criteria are made between thesis and non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

Target for O1: Understand Theory

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. Therefore, two significant distinctions in the target level performance criteria are made between thesis and non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.43, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #5 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. Therefore, two significant distinctions in the target level performance criteria are made between thesis and non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.43, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #5 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.
or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

**Target for O3: Apply Terminology and Theory**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. There are two significant distinctions in the target level performance criteria between the thesis and non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.43, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #6 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

**Target for O4: Communicate Effectively**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with averaged rating scores of 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.43, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #6 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

**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 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for each of the five student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. Note: For the 2005-2006 review cycle, the target level performance criteria for thesis and non-thesis students were set at the same level; that is, 80% of the students were expected to have averaged rating scores of 4.5 or higher for each of the student learning outcomes, as well as for the total measure of learning outcomes. After further consideration, it has been determined that the criteria set for non-thesis students was too stringent and that a new target level was needed to reflect more appropriately the expected competencies of the non-thesis students. Thus, the decision has been made to lower the target performance level from 4.5 to 4.0 for non-thesis students. Therefore, two significant distinctions in the target level performance criteria are made between thesis and non-thesis students. First, thesis students must meet all six of the learning outcomes, while the non-thesis students must meet the first five learning outcomes. The non-thesis students are not required to demonstrate an advanced application of research and statistical skills. Second, the non-thesis students must score an average of a 4.0 or higher (i.e., equivalent of an 80%) on the five learning outcomes, while the thesis students must score an average of a 4.5 or higher (i.e., equivalent of a 90%) on the six learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Ten non-thesis track students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2007. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.08 to 4.50 (on a 5-point scale). Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.18, with 90% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.08, with 80% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.40, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.43, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #6 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.
outcome #6 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. Finally, the average overall rating for the five learning outcomes is 4.26 (on a 5-point scale), with 80% of the students having average rating scores of 4.0 or higher for the total measure of learning outcomes. No comparison of findings are warranted at this time since the capstone seminar for non-thesis track students was not offered or assessed during the 2005-2006 review cycle.

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

### Development of Alumni Survey

Graduate Committee will design the graduate alumni survey.

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

**Relationships (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

### Capstone Seminar Review

Despite the fact that the capstone seminar provided instruction and assignments that met the learning outcomes for the non-thesis students, the graduate committee has suggested that an assessment of the seminar is necessary before it is taught again in Spring, 2008. To accomplish this task, the graduate coordinator will first meet with the instructor of the capstone seminar to review the instruction plan and course requirements to determine the degree to which the requirements are congruent with the student learning outcomes. Additionally, it must be determined the degree to which the course provides a comprehensive review of the core knowledge in the criminal justice and criminology fields. Next, the graduate coordinator will present the findings from this review to the graduate committee for further discussion and possible changes to the instructional plan and course requirements. The graduate committee will develop a revised course syllabus for the capstone seminar and present it to the department faculty for review and approval. Finally, the syllabus will be submitted to the CHHS Academic Affairs committee for review and approval, followed by its approval at the college’s faculty and staff meeting during the Fall semester, 2007.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Knowledge Assessment Survey of Non-Thesis Students
- **Outcome/Objective:** Apply Terminology and Theory | Communicate Effectively | Critical Thinking | Understand Integration of Systems and Processes | Understand Theory

**Implementation Description:** End of Fall Semester, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee

### Finalization of Alumni Survey

During the 2006-2007 academic year the Department of Criminal Justice conducted an external search for a new department chair. Dr. Brian Payne was hired and will join the department as the new chair effective July 1, 2007. It is reasonable to expect that Dr. Payne will conduct an evaluation of the B.S. and M.S. programs, as part of a comprehensive assessment of the department’s current strategic plan. To this end, the graduate committee would like to allow Dr. Payne the opportunity to review the survey instrument and offer suggested changes and additions to it. Presently, the graduate coordinator has already developed a preliminary draft of the alumni survey. While the major objective of the survey is to serve as a supplemental assessment tool for the student learning outcomes, we also are interested in evaluating recruitment practices, the capstone experience, and graduate admissions and program services. The target date for mailing the alumni survey has been delayed in order to solicit input from Dr. Payne. Once his input has been provided, the graduate committee will finalize the survey and specify the target level performance criteria for the different assessment areas. Then, the committee will present the proposed survey to the department faculty for discussion and approval. Our plan is to have the alumni survey completed and ready for mailing by the end of Spring semester, 2008.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (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, 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate coordinator and graduate committee

**Additional Resources:** The graduate committee will compile an alumni directory 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 five of the learning outcome areas, but especially with regard to applying learned terminology and theory to real-world situations, communicating effectively through their capstone paper (i.e., Final Report) and committee reports (i.e., oral defenses), and discussing an integrated view of crime and criminal justice systems and processes and
how the components interact and intersect to provide a coordinated justice administration.

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

Although the target level criteria were met for the first two learning outcomes, there is evidence that one or two students had difficulty demonstrating a working understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology and criminal justice and/or difficulty critically analyzing crime and justice issues. Specifically, one student did not have a strong working understanding of explanations of the correctional responses to crime and criminality (i.e., having a rating score of 3 on a 5-point scale). Additionally, two students had difficulty critically analyzing the research problem using qualitative and legal methods (i.e., having rating scores of 3 on a 5-point scale). The analysis suggests, although not significantly, that some monitoring of the Research Methods in Criminal Justice (CRJU 8610) and Legal Aspects in Criminal Justice (CRJU 8710) courses may be necessary to determine the degree to which the course content and homework assignments (i.e., research proposal) contribute to students’ ability to critically analyze their research problem using qualitative and legal methods.

### Georgia State University
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2006-2007 Early Childhood Education BSED**
*As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST*
*(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. The BSED has a robust enrollment each year and 100 students graduated from the program in 2006-2007 (49 in Fall ’06; 51 in Spring ’07).

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning (M: 10)**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Practices professional reflection (M: 5)**

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Fosters relationships with school and community (M: 6)**

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.
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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Quality professional programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 7)**
The teacher 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: 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. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 9)**
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
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. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 6: 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: 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. Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 7: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 3)**
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 8: 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

<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>9 Contemporary Issues--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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### SLO 9: 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

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</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 10: Applies knowledge of child development to learning (M: 8)

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

<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>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Faculty Rating: Communication &amp; Technology (O: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 6: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit “Technology” component from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 6, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to verbal, nonverbal, and media communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Uses communication skills and technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Faculty Rating: Planning for Instruction (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to planning for instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Can effectively plan for instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of candidates met Standard 7: Can effectively plan for instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Faculty Rating: Motivation &amp; Management (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. c.) Classroom center design and implementation evaluation (Student Teaching).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Can motivate and manage students for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of candidates met Standard 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Faculty Rating: Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to using multiple instructional strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Faculty Rating: Professional Reflection (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to professional reflection, “Reflections post-teaching” across all ten standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Practices professional reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
95% of candidates met Standard 9: Practices professional reflection

**M 6: 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," c.) Parent conference report and reflection

**Target for O3: Fosters relationships with school and community**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of candidates met Standard 10: Fosters relationships with school and community

**M 7: 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, 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**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

93% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**M 8: Faculty Rating: Understanding Student Development (O: 10)**

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 O10: Applies knowledge of child development to learning**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

94% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands student development

**M 9: Faculty Rating: Teaching Diverse Learners (O: 5)**

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 O5: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

93% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively teach diverse learners

**M 10: Faculty Rating: Assessment for Learning (O: 1)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 8: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit "Assessing the Impact on Student Learning" component from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 8, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to assessment for learning

**Target for O1: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

93% of candidates met Standard 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning

### 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

#### Can effectively plan for instruction

In order to continue to provide candidates with the experience of planning for instruction across the curriculum, we will require all student teachers to: plan and implement a five day, integrated, thematic unit or Planning, Teaching, Learning Module.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating: Planning for Instruction
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

#### Can motivate and manage students for learning

In order for candidates to continue to improve in the area of motivation and positive management of students for learning, we will require all student teachers to: successfully complete ten days of "role reversal," assuming all the duties and responsibilities of the classroom teacher.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating: Motivation & Management
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

#### Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Due to the positive gains in student performance on Standard 1, content pedagogical knowledge, from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007, we will continue to monitor the positive effects of the new math endorsement required for all students. (See Analysis section for discussion of endorsement)

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating: Content Pedagogical Knowledge
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

#### Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners

Teachers are increasingly required to meet diverse learning needs and abilities of all children in their classrooms. In order for candidates to improve in their effectiveness to teach diverse groups of learners, we will require all student teachers to: work closely with the classroom cooperating teacher, the ESOL and/or special education teacher to develop and implement appropriate accommodations for children with diverse learning needs. The university supervisor will check for and observe the implementation of these accommodations during weekly visits.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating: Teaching Diverse Learners
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

#### Fosters relationships with school and community

In providing candidates opportunities to foster relationships with the school and community, we will require all student teachers to:

- participate in parent conferences along with the cooperating teacher, conduct at least one parent conference, and write a follow-up reflection to share with the university supervisor.
Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Teachers are required to use multiple instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. In order for candidates to continue to improve in this area, we will require all student teachers to: 1) participate in a seminar to review and discuss procedures for referring students for support through SST (Student Support Teams) and complete an assignment in order to reflect upon instructional and behavioral factors that impact student achievement 2) plan and implement lessons that reflect the use of innovative and multiple instructional strategies; such as, cooperative groups, role play/simulations, props and manipulatives, critical thinking, analysis, and problem solving. The university supervisor will check for and observe the implementation of these strategies.

Practices professional reflection

In order for candidates to practice professional reflection, we will require all student teachers to: 1) provide oral and written reflection in response to observations conducted by their university supervisor, peers, and/or self and 2) participate in a final conference with the university supervisor to present artifacts and rationales, representing all ten standards, from their Professional Portfolio.

Understands and uses assessment for learning

In order for candidates to show their understanding and use of assessment to improve student learning, we will require all student teachers to: Implement a Planning, Teaching, Learning Module assessment plan. This plan will outline varied assessment methods, such as running records, rubrics, teacher-made tests, etc., that the student teacher has used. The assessment module will also feature graphs of pre-post student learning gains on relevant instructional objectives.

Understands student development regarding learning

In order for candidates to develop increasing understanding of how children learn and develop, we will require student teachers to: create a focal child portfolio containing observation notes, assessment data, work samples, and learning opportunities that support the child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Uses communications skills and technology

As teachers are becoming increasingly responsible for their understanding and use of technology in the classroom, we will require all student teachers to: implement at least one lesson incorporating technology as part of their Planning, Teaching, and Learning Module, a five day integrated, themetic unit of lessons.
**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 all ten standards on the established criteria (90%). Comparing 2005-2006 to 2006-2007, data show a range of performance rating increases across the standards from 10% to 18%. For example, student learning outcomes for Standard 1 (Content pedagogical knowledge) were dramatically improved by 14%. In order to meet national and state standards to improve the content knowledge of teachers, particularly in the area of mathematics, BSE graduates are now required to complete a 12 semester hour mathematics endorsement. The 2006 - 2007 student teachers have completed this math endorsement, which may be one explanation for the increased ratings.

In addition, student ratings for Standard 4 (Knowledge and Use of Multiple Instructional Strategies) increased 18%, after implementing an action plan requiring student teachers to participate in a seminar about the procedures for student referral to Student Support Teams. Students examined and discussed the instructional and behavioral factors that impact student achievement.

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

We continue to raise our expectations for teacher candidate performance to higher levels by working to strengthen candidates’ knowledge and ability through well developed action plans in the six areas with the lowest percentage ratings (below 95%): Standard 1 (93%): Demonstrates content knowledge and pedagogy; Standard 2 (94%): Understands student development regarding learning; Standard 3 (93%): Can effectively teach groups of diverse learners; Standard 4 (92%): Plans and implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate and meet the needs of all learners; Standard 8 (93%): Understands and uses assessments for learning. All other assessments (at or above 95%) will be monitored and maintained at the current high level of proficiency as indicated by the action plans provided for each of these standards.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Early Childhood Education EdS**

(Available: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST)

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Educational Specialist program provides opportunities for teachers to reflect upon and refine their understanding about being a teacher and a leader. Graduates of the Ed.S program are viewed as educational leaders and decision makers in their schools and communities. 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 was no program cohort during the 2006-2007 assessment period.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: 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.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3 PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice

**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 2: 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

**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 3: Applies 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; NBPTS#2 PSC Standard Domain: Content Knowledge
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: Shows commitment to learning and development (M: 2, 3)

Educators adjust their practice according to learners’ individual differences. Educators have an understanding of how learners develop and use this knowledge to make decisions about how to teach. Educators treat learners equitably. An educators’ mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their learners to address the needs of the whole child.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #1 PSC Standard Domain: Effects on P-12 Learning

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 5: Participates in professional 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 surrounding community as a resource for learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #5 PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Clinical Practice

Institutional Priority Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Action Research Project (O: 1, 2, 3)

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 O1: Manages and monitors student learning/development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
The Ed.S. Program was revised during 2006-2007. There was no cohort for this program during this assessment period. The new program begins summer 2007. See action plan and analysis for overview.

Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
The Ed.S. Program was revised during 2006-2007. There was no cohort for this program during this assessment period. The new program begins summer 2007. See action plan and analysis for overview.

Target for O3: Applies expertise for learning and development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
The Ed.S. Program was revised during 2006-2007. There was no cohort for this program during this assessment period. The new program begins summer 2007. See action plan and analysis for overview.

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: Manages and monitors student learning/development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
The Ed.S. Program was revised during 2006-2007. There was no cohort for this program during this assessment period. The new program begins summer 2007. See action plan and analysis for overview.

#### Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

#### Target for O3: Applies expertise for learning and development
All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

#### Target for O4: Shows commitment to learning and development
All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

#### Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities
All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### M 3: Teacher Development Project (O: 4, 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 O4: Shows commitment to learning and development
All students will "meet" the standard and 80% will "exceed" the standard.

#### Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities
All students will "meet" the standard and 80% will "exceed" 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:** Reflects on & learns from professional experience
- **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
**Implementation Description:** Next cohort to begin January 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Cohort facilitator and course instructor

**Revise EdS Program for 2007-2008**
See Analysis section for description of new program emphasis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** EdS Program Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
The EdS program will be revised to concentrate on training teacher researchers who use data to inform their policies, practices and epistemologies. The redirection of the program will take advantage of faculty expertise in the area of teacher action research and an articulated interest by EdS graduates to pursue a doctoral program built from the specialist program. The proposed new program would provide students with exemplary experiences in developing as educational specialists as well as initial mentored experiences with research activities as a primer for possible doctoral studies. The program maintains the positive components of the previous program (2005-2006) shown to develop reflective practitioners including an emphasis on professional learning communities, action research, and a socio-constructivist theory-base. The new program begins summer 2007. The 2007-2008 report will include new program outcomes and measures.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Previous analysis of the EdS program indicated that greater collaboration is needed across programs to develop reflectivity and to advance skills and dispositions for evidence-based practices. The new EdS program will collaborate and connect with the ECE Collaborative Masters’ Program and the PhD program. In addition, the program will design multiple structured learning communities situated in the schools where the participants will conduct their work. Action research and teacher development will be infused across the entire program and instructor to student ratio for mentoring experiences will be reduced to 1:9 through the use of regional workgroups.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Early Childhood Education GATAPP**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked **One-Time, Recurring, No Request**.

---

**Mission / Purpose**
The Urban Accelerated Certification and Master's program (UACM), a unit of the Early Childhood Education Department at Georgia State University, is committed to equity, collaboration, and excellence in field-based teacher education, research, and service. Unique within the education arena, the Urban Accelerated Certification and Master's program is a Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (GTAPP) provider. 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 UACM 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. For the 2006-2007 academic year the UACM program recommended 15 candidates for a teaching certificate in Early Childhood Education.

---

**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.

*Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA*

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**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>SLO 3: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 5: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate 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>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 6: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 7: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 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

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 9: 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

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 10: Applies knowledge of child development (M: 5)

The teacher candidate understands how children learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS 6 - Communication Skills and Tech. (O: 5)**

Field Observations, Classroom Management Portfolio, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Videotaped Cultural Lesson Plan and Analysis, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007**

- Target: Met
  - 94% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.

**M 2: Faculty STARS 7 - Plan for Instruction (O: 3)**

Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning Stations, Learning and Teaching Project, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007**

- Target: Met
  - 100% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.

**M 3: Faculty STARS 8 - Assessment for Learning (O: 4)**
Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning Stations, Learning and Teaching Project, 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**

80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Faculty STARS 5 - Motivate and Manage Students (O: 7)**

Field Observations, Classroom Management Portfolio, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Videotaped Cultural Lesson Plan, and Analysis, Learning Stations, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Faculty STARS 2 - Student Development (O: 10)**

Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Classroom Management Portfolio, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning and Teaching Project, and Portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O10: Applies knowledge of child development**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of teacher candidates achieved a satisfactory or better rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Faculty STARS 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners (O: 8)**

Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning and Teaching Project, Videotaped Cultural Lesson Plan and Analysis, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Faculty STARS 4 - Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 6)**

Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Thematic Unit, Learning Stations, Learning and Teaching Project, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Faculty STARS 1 - Content Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 9)**

Field Observations, Final Exams, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning Stations, Learning and Teaching Project, and Portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into
the STARS database for Standard 1.

**Target for O9: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of teacher candidates achieved a satisfactory or better rating.

**M 9: Faculty STARS 9 - Professional Reflection (O: 2)**

Field Observations, Literacy Assessment and Intervention Plan, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, Learning Stations, Learning and Teaching Project, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

94% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.

**M 10: Faculty STARS 10 - Professional Relationships (O: 1)**

Field Observations, Classroom Management Portfolio, Student Support Team Project, Thematic Unit, 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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

96% achieved a satisfactory or better rating.

**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
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** UAPP Faculty

**Develop and Implement Summer Field Experience**

The number one criticism of the UACM program from our teacher candidates is that they do not see the "best practices" that they are taught about in their courses in their student teaching placements. To address this concern, the faculty is partnering with Decatur School System to implement a Summer School Program where our former graduates model how to teach literacy through hands-on science activities in order to prepare the students for the summer CRCT test.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 1 - Content Pedagogical Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 10 - Professional Relationships | **Outcome/Objective:** Fosters relationships with school and community
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 2 - Student Development | **Outcome/Objective:** Applies knowledge of child development
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 4 - Multiple Instructional Strategies | **Outcome/Objective:** Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 5 - Motivate and Manage Students | **Outcome/Objective:** Can motivate and manage students for learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 6 - Communication Skills and Tech. | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses communication skills and technology
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 7 - Plan for Instruction | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 8 - Assessment for Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS 9 - Professional Reflection | **Outcome/Objective:** Practices professional reflection
Individualized Professional Development Plan

In order to meet the varied needs of individual candidates, an Individualized Professional Development Plan based on their individual STARS faculty ratings will be written. The candidate will work in consultation with their faculty mentor to address areas in need of improvement. This will be implemented during year two of the program (MEd.)

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS 1 - Content Pedagogical Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS 2 - Student Development | Outcome/Objective: Applies knowledge of child development
- Measure: Faculty STARS 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Measure: Faculty STARS 4 - Multiple Instructional Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- Measure: Faculty STARS 5 - Motivate and Manage Students | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS 6 - Communication Skills and Tech. | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
- Measure: Faculty STARS 7 - Plan for Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
- Measure: Faculty STARS 8 - Assessment for Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS 9 - Professional Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The results of implementing our action plan for the 2006-2007 academic year were successful in improving candidates' ability to understand and use assessment for learning (Standard 8), as shown by the increase in the outcome from 57% (2005-2006) to 81% (2006-2007). This can be attributed to 1. redesigning the Student Learning Project to focus on both pre and post assessments, 2. developing a SST simulation which includes training on various assessments that can be used to gather information about diverse learners in order to inform instruction, and 3. developing an assessment unit as a part of the mathematics methods course which includes the use of a new assessment methods textbook. In addition, for the 2006-2007 academic year, we raised our cut score for our target performance level from 75% to 85% for all standards except Standard 8 (Assessment), which was raised from 75% to 80%. Standard 8 continues to be one of the most challenging standards for pre-service teachers. Our assessments show that our candidates are able to successfully meet all ten of the INTASC Standards: 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. Understands and uses assessment for learning, 9. 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?
Although our aggregate scores met or exceeded our all ten of our set standards, we are currently working to improve our candidates' ability to meet the standards at even higher levels. The faculty decided this could be best accomplished through the implementation of an Individualized Professional Development Plan and a summer school field experience that models best practices in teaching and learning. As such, we plan to raise our cut score for our target performance level from 80% to 85% for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Early Childhood Education MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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. In 2006-2007, 18 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.
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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Out of 18 students: 5 students received 2/3 13 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.72. Therefore students as a whole met target

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Out of 18 students: 5 students received 2/3 13 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.72. Therefore students as a whole met target

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Out of 18 students: 5 students received 2/3 13 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.72. Therefore students as a whole met target

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Out of 18 students: 5 students received 2/3 13 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.72. Therefore students as a whole met target

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Out of 18 students: 4 students received 2/3 14 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.78 Therefore students as a whole met target

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

expand options for format of Capstone

Students demonstrate in their Capstones how the CMP program has changed their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to teaching and learning. Capstones have previously been in written text format. Capstones may now be partially presented in multimedia formats

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Experience Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.
  | Educator will show commitment to student learning.

Implementation Description: Summer 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Program Co-directors

synthesis of knowledge across courses

During each critical issues course taught by the program directors, faculty and students will examine ways to integrate and synthesize knowledge gained across all CMP courses
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Summer 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Program Co-directors

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Students continue to demonstrate their understanding of the importance of building community in their classrooms. Students demonstrated in their Capstones their ability to support their growth by drawing from information across the courses rather than just using one course as the stimulus for their growth. For example, students who indicated in their Capstones they had grown in their understanding of the importance of empowering their students as learners identified specific information from math, literacy, child development courses to support their growth. (Related Objectives 1, 4,5)

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Continued attention is needed to deepen students' ability to integrate information across courses. Specifically, students need to (a) identify how the unique characteristics of young child influence their decisions about teaching math and literacy and (b) identify how the social and cultural characteristics of the students in their classrooms influence their decisions about teaching math and literacy. Continued attention is needed to assist students to expand their conceptions of how learning can be demonstrated. Specifically, more attention is needed to examine what types of knowledge can be demonstrated in aural, physical, visual media.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Urban Accelerated Certification and Master's program (UACM), a unit of the Early Childhood Education Department at Georgia State University, is committed to equity, collaboration, and excellence in field-based teacher education, research, and service. Unique within the education arena, the Urban Accelerated Certification and Master's program is a Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (GTAPP) provider. 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 UACM 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 to prepare teachers for success in urban schools. For the 2006-2007 academic year the UACM program recommended 17 candidates for a Master's Degree in Education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 4: Shows commitment to student learning & development (M: 1)
Educator is committed to students and their learning and/or development.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Applies 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: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: 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
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: 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
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives
1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Participates in professional learning communities (M: 4)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 4)
A summary faculty rating derived from the Coaching Experience, Capstone Project, Problem Solution Project, Student Learning Project, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O4: Shows commitment to student learning & development
80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
82% achieved an intermediate or better rating.

M 2: Faculty STARS 3- Manage & monitor student learning (O: 1)
A summary faculty rating derived from the Coaching Experience, Capstone Project, Problem Solution Project, Student Learning Project, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O1: Manages and monitors student learning/development
80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
86% achieved an intermediate or better rating.

M 3: Faculty STARS 4 - Reflection (O: 2)
A summary faculty rating derived from the Coaching Experience, Capstone Project, Problem Solution Project, Student Learning Project, Action Research Project, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences
80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
65% achieved an intermediate or better rating.
M 4: Faculty STARS 5- Professional Learning Communities (O: 3)

A summary faculty rating derived from the Coaching Experience and the Capstone Project will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O3: Participates in professional learning communities**

80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

83% achieved an intermediate or better rating.

M 5: Faculty STARS 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop (O: 5)

A summary faculty rating derived from the Coaching Experience, Capstone Project, Problem Solution Project, Student Learning Project, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O5: Applies expertise for learning and development**

80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

82% achieved an intermediate or better rating.

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
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Nancy Schafer

**Coordinate Major Projects Schedule**

In order that the Master's candidates have more time to think systematically about their practice and learn from experience, the faculty will coordinate a schedule of due dates for major projects. This faculty collaboration will give candidates more time to reflect on and learn from these assignments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 4 - Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences
- **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 Academic Year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** UACM Faculty

**Induction through Critical Friends Groups**

In order to support candidates who have yet to meet the performance target(s), the faculty will facilitate ongoing induction groups called Critical Friends Groups (CFG). CFGs bring together educators to mutually problem solve and to stimulate professional growth of the peers. Candidates will work in consultation with faculty to address areas in need of improvement. This action plan will be implemented during the year after completion of the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 3- Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 4 - Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences
  - Measure: Faculty STARS 5- Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities
- **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 Academic Year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** UACM Faculty

**Restructure the focus of the Curriculum Courses**

Since all candidates in the Master's Year of the UACM Program are first year teachers, the program serves as an induction into teaching. As such, the faculty feels that the Curriculum Integration and Assessment courses should be revised from predominately theory-based courses to more field-based courses in order to help teachers implement best practices within the standards-based reform curriculums that they are mandated to use in many of their schools.
Revising and Implementing a Capstone Experience

Faculty will develop a capstone experience. A crucial phase of UACM Master's degree program will be a culminating Capstone Experience. This project will emphasize the use of public display to encourage candidates to synthesize and reflect on their own learning experiences and how these experiences empower them as an educator. Specifically, the purpose of this capstone is to synthesize the candidate’s graduate experiences, culminating in a video presentation. This synthesis will demonstrate the candidate’s knowledge of theories related to various aspects of pedagogy and the content fields, as well as skill in applying that knowledge to schools and classrooms. Knowledge is drawn from candidates' major projects, personal experiences, and coursework. A key component of the Capstone is the idea of “Empowering Education” within an urban setting. Empowering Education is a critical-democratic pedagogy for self and social change (Shor, 1992, P.15). Thus, education is a process through which teachers and students mutually investigate subject matter as it relates to personal issues, social issues and academic knowledge. Through this dialogue an evolving, democratic learning community (Johnson, 2004) is built that enables students and teachers to become active agents of learning. Ultimately, the process empowers teachers to transform traditional approaches so that students develop as critical thinkers, inspired learners, skilled workers, and involved citizens. Each of the Master's candidates will create a 6-10 minute video synthesis of their Master’s degree experiences. It must be developed around the theme of being an empowered educator, and it must synthesize how each of their major projects meets the NBPTS standards and empowers them and/or their students. The capstone video presentation will include the following: 1. an introduction of what it means to be an empowered educator, 2. an Action Research synthesis, 3. a Problem Solution Project synthesis, 4. a Curriculum Integration synthesis, 5. a “Cross Career Learning Communities” synthesis, 6. a Student Learning Project synthesis, 7. an optional personal experience synthesis, and 8. a conclusion that reflects the impact of the Master's Degree experience on the candidate’s teaching and learning.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measurement | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS 2- Expertise for Learning & Development | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty STARS 3- Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- Measure: Faculty STARS 4 - Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experiences
- Measure: Faculty STARS 5 - Professional Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities

Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: UACM 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 meet the following NBPTS standards: 1. Shows commitment to student learning and development, 2. Applies expertise for learning and development, 3. Manages and monitors student learning/development, and 5. Participates in professional learning communities. The assessments of the standards show that candidates scored particularly high in the area of participating in professional learning communities, which if they continue to participate may have ongoing positive effects on their teaching and learning.

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 4 (Reflects on & learns from professional experiences) by: 1. revising and implementing a Capstone Experience, 2. restructuring the focus of the Curriculum and Assessment courses, and 3. coordinating the major projects schedule.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Early Childhood Education PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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).

### 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Three of three (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeship in Su 2006 - Sp 2007.

**Target for O3: Are active seekers of knowledge**

Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Three of three (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeship in Su 2006 - Sp 2007.

**Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers**  
Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
Three of three (100%) of students successfully completed their research apprenticeship in Su 2006 - Sp 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
Three out of three (100%) students successfully completed their teaching apprenticeships during Su06-Sp07 (Kramb, Durden & Mays)

**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 areas, and (c) the ability to present one’s thinking and ideas orally.

**Target for O3: Are active seekers of knowledge**  
All students successfully complete their comprehensive examination on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
Two out of two students (100%) eligible to take comprehensive exams successfully passed their exams during academic year Su06-Sp 07. (Durden, Mays)

**Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers**  
All students successfully complete their comprehensive examination on their first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**  
Two out of two students (100%) eligible to take comprehensive exams successfully passed their exams during academic year Su06-Sp 07. (Durden, Mays)

**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

**Annual review process**  
The PhD program continues to modify the apprenticeships and will pilot those changes in Summer 2007. We will now have an annual review process (to be implemented Fall 07) to review all current doctoral students work and progress toward goals.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Are active seekers of knowledge  
| Are thoughtful writers and speakers  
| Research Apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Are active seekers of knowledge  
| Are thoughtful writers and speakers | Demonstrates research skills  
Measure: Teaching Apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 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?

The assessment reporting process indicates to us that we need a more comprehensive process for reviewing and documenting student's progress. A new annual review process to be implemented beginning fall 2007 should assist with this.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Economics BA,BBA,BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Apply to specific fields (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)
To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Benefits and costs (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)
To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Communication (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)
To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.

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

**SLO 4: contemporary issues (diverse disciplinary perspec) (M: 2)**
Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**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

**SLO 5: contemporary issues (global questions) (M: 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 6: Economics Basic Theories (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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 each TE should be at least 60%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score for all the students that took the TEs in both Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 was 68% on the MicroTE and 55% on the MacroTE. 77% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 38% of the students scored at least 60%. The majority of students improved their scores on both TEs when taken at the end of the semester compared to their scores at the beginning of the semester.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score for all the students that took the TEs in both Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 was 68% on the MicroTE and 55%
on the MacroTE. 77% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 38% of the students scored at least 60%. The majority of students improved their scores on both TEs when taken at the end of the semester compared to their scores at the beginning of the semester.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score for all the students that took the TEs in both Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 was 68% on the MicroTE and 55% on the MacroTE. 77% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 38% of the students scored at least 60%. The majority of students improved their scores on both TEs when taken at the end of the semester compared to their scores at the beginning of the semester.

**M 2: 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 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
For ECON 2100 the assessments were done in 4 sections in Spring 2007 (a total of 226 students), and 98% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 86% 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 Spring 2007 (a total of 180 students), and 90% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 72% 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 3 sections in Spring 2007 (a total of 367 students), and 90% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 90% 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 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
For ECON 2100 the assessments were done in 4 sections in Spring 2007 (a total of 226 students), and 98% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 86% 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 Spring 2007 (a total of 180 students), and 90% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 72% 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 3 sections in Spring 2007 (a total of 367 students), and 90% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 5); 90% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 6).

**M 3: Group Project in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)**
The group project will allow students to work together to analyze how the benefits and costs of a particular public policy are to be evaluated. The topic will be chosen by the group and should not be one covered in class. Groups consisting of no more than five students (and no fewer than two) will be assigned during the second week of the semester. Group presentations will take place during the last two weeks of classes, and should last about 15 minutes each. Groups must use PowerPoint for their presentations, which they will hand in at the time of the presentation. (A paper is not required for the group project.) Library research is required for the group project, and sources should be carefully noted within the presentation. The presentation should be about ten minutes long. The group can choose who speaks during the presentation. The group may have more than one of the group members speak during the presentation if the group feels it would enhance the presentation. Each individual must also hand in the evaluation sheet provided on the last page of the syllabus. The group project will count for 20% of the course grade.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**
The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the group project was 92.5%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the group project was 92.5%.

**Target for O3: Communication**
The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the group project was 92.5%.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the group project was 92.5%.

**M 4: Exams and Quizzes in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)**
There are two unit exams in ECON 4999 - one exam after the first three modules (counting for 30% of the course grade) and a second exam after the last module (counting for 20% of the course grade). Class participation and quizzes count for 5% of the course grade.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade was 90.6% on the first exam, 77.4% on the second exam, and 79.6% for quizzes.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade was 90.6% on the first exam, 77.4% on the second exam, and 79.6% for quizzes.

**Target for O3: Communication**
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade was 90.6% on the first exam, 77.4% on the second exam, and 79.6% for quizzes.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
The average grade on each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade was 90.6% on the first exam, 77.4% on the second exam, and 79.6% for quizzes.

**M 5: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)**
The individual book review will require the student to explore topics in economics that he or she is interested in and choose a book to read and thoroughly review. The review should be done in 5-6 pages (using one-inch margins, Times New Roman 12 font). The instructor must approve of the book first, two weeks before the first test is scheduled. In addition, an outline for the book review will be due one week before the first test. The individual book review will count for 15% of the course grade.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the individual book review was 89.9%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the individual book review was 89.9%.

**Target for O3: Communication**
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the individual book review was 89.9%.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average grade on the individual book review was 89.9%.
The student portfolio, due on the day the final exam is scheduled, aims to prepare the student for the job market and encourages the student to look back at economics courses taken and assess what he or she has learned. In creating the portfolio, the student should: (1) Put together a résumé (possibly getting help from the Georgia State University Career Services Center); (2) Research the job market for economists and summarize the typical jobs and starting salaries for economics majors (also providing this information in a table embedded in the paper created using a spreadsheet), including a page with a basic description of what economics is, how economists think, and what economists do; (3) Summarize his/her skills and how they can be applied; (4) Provide a list of all economics courses taken, including information about when and whom the course was taken with; (5) Summarize what he/she learned in the economics program. The student portfolio will count for 5% of the course grade.

**Target for O1: Apply to specific fields**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 86.9%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 86.9%.

**Target for O3: Communication**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 86.9%.

**Target for O6: Economics Basic Theories**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 86.9%.

**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://aysps.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
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- | Benefits and costs | Economics Basic Theories

**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.

**make needed adjustments to ECON 4999**

This is the first year that ECON 4999 was offered. One change we expect is much larger enrollments as the new requirement kicks in for more students. The instructor commented that there is probably more emphasis on microeconomics than macroeconomics in the course, which is the likely explanation behind the difference in the results on the MicroTE and MacroTE. Also, the instructor indicated that some of the individual book review will need more guidance provided to the students because too many of them treated it more like a summary and demonstrated less critical thinking than was hoped (she also indicated that she was more lenient on grading for this reason). She also indicated that the first exam needed some revision; some questions were somewhat ambiguously worded and
again led to more lenient grading; this is the likely explanation why the first exam score average is so much higher than the second exam score. Some readings that were a bit too technical will also be replaced with readings that are more appropriate for undergraduate seniors. Appropriate adjustments are being made to the assignments and exams to improve the course.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams and Quizzes in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Book Review in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Examination</td>
<td>Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Economics Basic Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Economics Basic Theories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee
Additional Resources: More resources may be necessary in the future if enrollments increase substantially and more sections of ECON 4999 need to be offered.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The Department of Economics is doing well at teaching contemporary issues in our core courses. Comparing this year’s results with last year’s results, the percentage of students getting at least 3 out of 5 questions correct has increased (with the one exception being learning outcome 6 in the 2105 classes which went from 84% to 72%, but both are higher than the target of 60% last year and the higher target of 70% this year). More students were assessed in all classes (last year, the total was 525; this year the total was 793). The results of the tracking exams indicate that students performed best on the MacroTE and not as well on the MacroTE. Those students assessed in ECON 4999 appear to be doing quite well demonstrating competence in most of the undergraduate learning outcomes as all targets (with the exception of the MacroTE) were met. It is difficult to compare these results to last year because most of the measures where changed from last year (and no data was collected on many of the measures last year); just having appropriate data to analyze is an improvement over last year. The Department of Economics has followed up on both of the action plans from last year. The assessments were moved to the newly developed ECON 4999 course (which is now required for all newly declared undergraduate economics majors - with the exception of the IEML students). The alumni survey was not done in the past and it was decided that it should be dropped from the assessment plan because the undergraduate program committee decided that it would not add much value to the assessments.

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

The primary change needed is the assessment of more students. This should naturally occur as the new requirement for ECON 4999 becomes effective for more students each year. There are some adjustments needed (as noted in the action plan) for the ECON 4999 course. We will likely expand the number of students assessed in both ECON 4999 and in the core courses in the future.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Economics MA**
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(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 premier 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.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**
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-, C+, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definition, 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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 15 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2006-2007, with 4 As, 4Bs, 5Cs, 2Fs. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed the weakest factor continued to be Mathematics with a mean score of 3.47, while the strongest factor was Analytics with a mean score of 4.33. There were 26 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2006-2007, with 10 As, 14 Bs, and 2 Cs. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Analytics, Communication, and Creativity with a mean score of 3.62, while the strongest part continued to be Definitions with a mean score of 4. There were 15 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2006-2007, with 7 As, 6 Bs and 2 Cs. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest factor was Math with a mean score of 4.07, while the strongest factor was Application with a mean score of 4.53. A comparison with last year’s findings show an improvement.

M 2: 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).

Findings 2006-2007 - 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): 3.75 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 3.875 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.375 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.5 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.5 for Econometric Skills, 4.5 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.625 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 an improvement from the last cohort and that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily.
a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.79 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.05 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.89 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 3.95 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.13 for Econometric Skills, 4.05 for Economic Analysis, 3.53 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.31 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 this cohort was on par with previous cohorts and 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 2006-2007 - 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): 3.79 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 3.875 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.375 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.5 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.5 for Econometric Skills, 4.5 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.625 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 this cohort was on par with previous cohorts and 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 2006-2007 - 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): 3.79 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 3.875 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.375 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.5 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.5 for Econometric Skills, 4.5 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.31 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 this cohort was on par with previous cohorts and that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily.

M 3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
We received 2 responses to this year’s Alumni Survey. For the question about the most useful skills learned in the program, one alumna mentioned practical framework as the main skill. For the question about which skills or topics should be more emphasized, one alumna indicated that the program should strengthen practical and theoretical frameworks. The other one did not respond to both questions.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
We received 3 responses to this year’s Alumni Survey. For the question about the most useful skills learned in the program, two alumni mentioned critical thinking as the main skill. For the question about which skills or topics should be more emphasized, one alumna listed math skills. The other two did not respond to this question.
**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
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Core Examination | Analytical Skills
- Implementation Description: Summer 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of macroeconomics and microeconomics core

**Strengthen Math in Core Courses**

Mathematics continues to be the weakest part in macro, and emerges as the weakest part in econometrics. Instructors of these courses should strive to strengthen this area.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Core Examination | Analytical Skills
- Implementation Description: Summer 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of macroeconomics and econometrics core

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**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 (53% for Macroeconomics, 92% for Microeconomics, and 87% for Econometrics). It should be noted that the percentage of passing for macro decreased slightly compared with the previous year (55%), while for both micro and econometrics the percentage increased significantly compared with the previous year (71% for micro and 63% for econometrics). The main concern for Macroeconomics continued to be Mathematics, and Mathematics emerged as the main concern for Econometrics, while the main concerns for Microeconomics were Analytics, Communication and Creativity. Compared to the previous year, students continued to show weakness in the Macroeconomics exam, and showed a marginal improvement in mathematics for the Microeconomics exam; for the Econometrics exam, the weakest factor changed from Communication to Mathematics. These weak factors again point to weak math backgrounds of some of our MA-Econ students. The strongest areas were Analytics (in Macroeconomics), Application (in Econometrics), 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): 3.75 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 3.875 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.375 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.5 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.5 for Econometric Skills, 4.5 for Economic Analysis, 3.5 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.625 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 a modest improvement compared to the previous year and that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily. For this year, the assessments of students were based on their final exams in the three core courses, Macroeconomics, Microeconomics, and Econometrics. The department no longer administers comprehensive exams for MA-Econ students. According to alumni, critical thinking is one of the skills learned in the program that is most useful to them in their present job. This implies that objectives #1 and #4 are being met successfully.

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

The area of Mathematics must be strengthened in the three core courses. This goes to improving outcomes in learning objectives #1 and #2. Last year’s Alumni Survey suggested the need of more econometrics in this program. As a result, the department approved the creation of a new course that would be the second econometrics course taken by students in the program. The course will be required, and it will be offered Spring 2008 for the first time.
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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)**
To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

**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.

**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.

**SLO 4: Conducting Independent Research (M: 3, 4)**
To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Eight out of 11 students attempting the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam in June 2006 received a grade of Pass, and the other 3 received a grade of Fail. The three students attempted the exam a second time in January 2007 and all 3 of them passed. Their overall average grade improved significantly from a High Fail to a Pass (from 2.11 to 4.05), which was even a higher average than that of the 8 students of the same cohort that passed the exam on the first attempt. Furthermore, these 3 students had a higher grade in each and every category than in their own previous attempt and also compared to those passing the exam in June 2006. There was also a notable improvement in the Application section from an average of 2 to 3.7. The Microeconomics comprehensive was taken by 19 students in Fall 2006. Twelve of 19 received a grade of Pass and the remaining 7 failed. The overall average grade for passing students was 3.7 ("Pass") out of 5, whereas failing students averaged 1.97 ("High Fail"). The twelve students that passed had scores in the "Pass" range (3.5 and above) in all categories. Hence, the objectives are being met with regards to the categories of cognition. Five students had another attempt at this exam in January 2007, with 4 of them passing. The average score of these 4 students increased from 1.97 to 3.57, a notable increase.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Eight out of 11 students attempting the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam in June 2006 received a grade of Pass, and the other 3 received a grade of Fail. The three students attempted the exam a second time in January 2007 and all 3 of them passed. Their overall average grade improved significantly from a High Fail to a Pass (from 2.11 to 4.05), which was even a higher average than that of the 8 students of the same cohort that passed the exam on the first attempt. Furthermore, these 3 students had a higher grade in each and every category than in their own previous attempt and also compared to those passing the exam in June 2006. There was also a notable improvement in the Application section from an average of 2 to 3.7. The Microeconomics comprehensive was taken by 19 students in Fall 2006. Twelve of 19 received a grade of Pass and the remaining 7 failed. The overall average grade for passing students was 3.7 ("Pass") out of 5, whereas failing students averaged 1.97 ("High Fail"). The twelve students that passed had scores in the "Pass" range (3.5 and above) in all categories. Hence, the objectives are being met with regards to the categories of cognition. Five students had another attempt at this exam in January 2007, with 4 of them passing. The average score of these 4 students increased from 1.97 to 3.57, a notable increase.

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

Addressing Alumni Suggestions

The 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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

Add question regarding publication status of diss.
We will add a question regarding the publication status of the dissertation work to the Alumni Survey.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

Implementation Description: Prior to administering next survey in Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Coordinator

Add questions to exam evaluations
We will add questions to the comprehensive and field exam evaluations for faculty to write about specific weaknesses and strengths of each exam in their own words.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
- Measure: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods
- Measure: Field Examination | Outcome/Objective: Field specialization

Implementation Description: Immediate
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Coordinator

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. In the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam, the students who did not pass on the first try showed a significant improvement in their second attempt. Their average score on this second attempt was even higher than that of their peers who passed on the first attempt. Further, performance in the Application area (which had been a concern two years ago) has continued to improve to a Pass average (3.0). The Microeconomics comprehensive exam also shows that students are meeting learning outcome #1. The average for the passing students on the first attempt was a high 3.7 out of 5.0, showing strength in all of the categories. Those students who passed the exam on a second attempt also showed significant improvement reaching the same averages as their peers who passed on the first try. There are no particular categories of weakness identified by this exam. It appears that students who do not pass on the first try increase their study effort in learning the material and generally pass on the second attempt, which is the intended result. 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 about the Contribution of the dissertation, 7 of 15 dissertations were rated at the highest level of contribution (5.0) by faculty evaluators. This is an improvement over last year’s ratings that had a 4.0 rating for this category for all the dissertations. Moreover, faculty rated most dissertations as likely to be published in a top field journal. 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 scores comparable to 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, economic theory, and teaching learned in the program as useful skills for them in their present job. No doubt this reflects the emphasis that the department has placed in these areas. We have a thorough econometrics sequence of up to 5 courses that students can take. Likewise the economic theory core also includes 5 courses covering the foundations and the latest advances in theory. Finally, students go through a training program to be certified as graduate teaching assistants, and often get to teach their own undergraduate courses after certification.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The areas of concern brought up last year by the Alumni Survey were the following: areas such as “practical econometrics”, statistical software programming(e.g., Stata, SAS), data skills, and “project evaluation” should receive greater emphasis. Some of this year’s survey responses offered these same suggestions. After last year's survey, the department implemented changes that begin to address these concerns. Specifically, the faculty who teach the econometrics sequence agreed to make changes in the course content of the econometrics courses. These courses will now include more data management and project evaluation components. Since these courses are taken during the first and second year of the program, it will be some time before graduates can reflect on the contribution of the new material. We also intend to refine some of the questionnaires that provide data on the measures, to obtain yet more in depth information on how the objectives are being met.
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 33 Ph.D. students in Special Education during the 06-07 year. Four of the students were PULSE students, and five were PRIDE students, all nine of whom were funded through grants from the U.S. Department of Education.

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.

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: Develop content expertise (M: 4)

Develop content expertise in special education.

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: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Other evaluation in this area for the 06-07 year include the following: 14 articles were submitted by 10 students (with students being the senior author on 4 of these articles); 13 articles were published by 8 students (with students being the senior author on 2 articles); 7 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 4 students; and 8 grants were prepared with the assistance of 7 students.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students who have reached candidacy have assisted or taught at least one university course. Other evaluation in this area for the 06-07 year include the following: 12 students assisted in teaching 43 courses; 9 students taught 23 courses as GTAs; 15 students gave 36 guest lectures; and 9 students supervised 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 candidacy.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral students made at least one conference or workshop presentation by candidacy. Other evaluation in this area of the 06-07 year includes the following: 8 students made 13 national conference presentations; 7 students made 9 state conference presentations; 12 students made 83 workshop presentations; and 4 students held offices in professional organizations.

**M 4: Develop content expertise in special education (O: 4)**

Demonstrates expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and evaluation of peer-reviewed research in the field of special education.

**Target for O4: Develop content expertise**

Successful rating on annual evaluation consisting of a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exam scores, and prospectus (as appropriate).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In the 06-07 academic year, there were 32 students enrolled in the EXC doctoral program. According to their annual evaluation ratings, all students are demonstrating expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Special Education.

**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

**Exit interviews**

Evaluate use of exit interviews as a program indicator.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

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

- **Measure:** Develop content expertise in special education | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop content expertise
- **Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop expertise in professional development
- **Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop expertise in research skills
- **Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey-Teaching Section | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop expertise teaching in higher education

**Implementation Description:** April 08

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Heller and the Post Masters’ Advisory Committee

**Refine database for professional development**
Construct separate database of recent graduates to determine amount of professional development activities to serve as a baseline for program evaluation purposes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development | Outcome/Objective: Engage in professional development

Implementation Description: April 08
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller and the Post Masters’ Advisory Committee
Additional Resources: Database personnel

Refine database for research
Construct separate database of recent graduates to determine amount of research to serve as a baseline for program evaluation purposes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section | Outcome/Objective: Develop expertise in research skills

Implementation Description: April 08
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller and Post Masters’ Advisory Committee
Additional Resources: Person to work on database

Refine database for teaching
Construct separate database of recent graduates to determine teaching experience to serve as a baseline for program evaluation purposes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Teaching Section | Outcome/Objective: Develop expertise teaching in higher education

Implementation Description: April 08
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller and Post Masters’ Advisory Committee
Additional Resources: Database personnel.

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.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We want to create a separate database of recent graduates to serve as a baseline for program evaluation purposes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Educational Leadership EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The last time this course was offered, 100 percent of students received an "A".

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This course was not offered during the designated time period.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This course was not offered during the designated time period.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This course was not offered during the designated time period.

### 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):**
- **Measure:** Advanced Field Experience
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can facilitate programs and reform projects

**Implementation Description:** Academic year 2006-07
**Responsible Person/Group:** All members of the Educational Leadership unit

#### 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 2007-07 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 2006-07
**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 2007-07 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

#### 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 2007-08 academic year. Because we are currently engaged in a major redesign of the program in accordance with Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) and Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) requirements, no additional changes will be initiated until the new program is finalized and approved.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Modeling the theory-practice dyad in leadership
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply theory to practice of Ed. Admin.

**Implementation Description:** Ed.S. program redesign must be completed by 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** All members of the Educational Leadership unit

#### Facilitation of programs and reform projects

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. Because we are currently engaged in a major redesign of the program in accordance with Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) and Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) requirements, no additional changes will be initiated until the new program is finalized and approved.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Understanding urban educational leadership

Program faculty will continue the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-08 academic year. Because we are currently engaged in a major redesign of the program in accordance with Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) and Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) requirements, no additional changes will be initiated until the new program is finalized and approved.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Use of research

Program faculty will continue the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-08 academic year. Because we are currently engaged in a major redesign of the program in accordance with Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) and Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) requirements, no additional changes will be initiated until the new program is finalized and approved.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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?

Overall, the assessments in the Ed.S. program indicate that the program is strong in regard to outcomes and objectives. We met or exceeded the only target available to us for the designated time period. 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. However, as mentioned in the action plan, we are currently undergoing a required program redesign. During this transitional phase, analysis of the existing program is somewhat moot because the implementation of the new program will probably necessitate writing new objectives and assessments. This process is proceeding step by step and we will not have a complete picture of the new program for some time.

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

Please refer to the above reflection with regard to the program redesign we are currently engaged in.
**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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 4. 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**

- 1.3 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

**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 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 collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

**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 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 collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

**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.
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

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
EPEL 7000: 84% EPEL 7330: 88% EPEL 7410: 96% EPSF 7450: 81% EPEL 7500: 74% EPEL 7510: 77% Total: 83%

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. Literature Review (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

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Problem Statement: Target 81% Unacceptable 4% Literature Review: Target 74% Unacceptable 11% Sources: Target 73% Unacceptable 3% Analysis: Target 66% Unacceptable 23% Interpretation: Target 71% Unacceptable 16% Writing: Target 72% Unacceptable 12% Total: Target 73% Unacceptable 12%

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 candidate. Candidates are required to complete a range of tasks and assessments that demonstrate knowledge and skills in each of the GLIS'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

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Module: Target 84% Unacceptable 2% Log: Target 71% Unacceptable 7% Reflection: Target 74% Unacceptable 5% Plan: Target 86% Unacceptable 1% Profile: Target 88% Unacceptable 3% Presentation: Target 77% Unacceptable 8% Total: Target 80% Unacceptable 4%

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 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 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
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 acccots all standards and in each standard.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Standard 1: 84% Standard 2: 86% Standard 3: 72% Standard 4: 83% Standard 5: 94% Standard 6: 87% Total: 84%

### 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 identitification 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 perform as change agent in schools  
**Implementation Description:** October 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** EPEL Unit Faculty

**Can provide leadership for urban education**

The STARS Student Survey was developed to the 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.

### Action research

The data indicate that students can perform action research at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit is currently undergoing a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. Although this long process will not be completed until 2008, it is already clear that curricula, assessments, and performance measures will change significantly from what they are now. Therefore, the measures described in this assessment plan are in the process of being phased out. What they will be replaced with is yet to be determined but there is no point taking any action on the current measures since the program is changing. Once the program redesign is complete and our changes have been submitted and approved, new outcomes/objectives, measures and findings, and action plans will be generated. Until that time, everything will be maintained as it is.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium
**Measure:** STARS Survey (individual mean scores)
**Outcome/Objective:** Can provide leadership for urban education

**Implementation Description:** Program redesign must be completed by 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** EPEL Unit Faculty

### Change agents in schools

The data indicate that students can be effective change agents at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit is currently undergoing a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. Although this long process will not be completed until 2008, it is already clear that curricula, assessments, and performance measures will change significantly from what they are now. Therefore, the measures described in this assessment plan are in the process of being phased out. What they will be replaced with is yet to be determined but there is no point taking any action on the current measures since the program is changing. Once the program redesign is complete and our changes have been submitted and approved, new outcomes/objectives, measures and findings, and action plans will be generated. Until that time, everything will be maintained as it is.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Measure:** Performance Leadership Portfolio
**Outcome/Objective:** Can perform as change agent in schools

**Implementation Description:** Program redesign must be completed by 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** All educational leadership faculty

### Leadership for urban education

The data indicate that students can provide effective leadership for urban education at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit is currently undergoing a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. Although this long process will not be completed until 2008, it is already clear that curricula, assessments, and performance measures will change significantly from what they are now. Therefore, the measures described in this assessment plan are in the process of being phased out. What they will be replaced with is yet to be determined but there is no point taking any action on the current measures since the program is changing. Once the program redesign is complete and our changes have been submitted and approved, new outcomes/objectives, measures and findings, and action plans will be generated. Until that time, everything will be maintained as it is.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Measure:** STARS Survey (individual mean scores)
**Outcome/Objective:** Can design and implement action research

**Implementation Description:** Program redesign must be completed by 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** All educational leadership faculty

### Leadership theory in schools

The data indicate that students can apply leadership knowledge at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit is currently undergoing a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. Although this long process will not be completed until 2008, it is already clear that curricula, assessments, and performance measures will change significantly from what they are now. Therefore, the measures described in this assessment plan are in the process of being phased out. What they will be replaced with is yet to be determined but there is no point taking any action on the current measures since the program is changing. Once the program redesign is complete and our changes have been submitted and approved, new outcomes/objectives, measures and findings, and action plans will be generated. Until that time, everything will be maintained as it is.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluations in key courses | Outcome/Objective: Can apply leadership theory in practice

Implementation Description: Program redesign must be completed by 2008
Responsible Person/Group: All Educational leadership faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The data indicate that students are achieving proficiency in educational leadership theory and skills at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit is currently undergoing a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. Although this long process will not be completed until 2008, it is already apparent that curricula, assessments, and performance measures will change significantly from what they are now. Therefore, the objectives, measures, and assessments described in this assessment report are in the process of being phased out. What they will be replaced with is yet to be determined but it makes no sense to take any action on the current measures since the program is being revamped. Once the program redesign is complete and our changes have been submitted and approved, appropriate new outcomes/objectives, measures, and findings, and action plans will be generated. Until that time, everything will be maintained as it is.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Refer to above analysis for an explanation of this assessment.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
The educational Leadership MEd program has maintained it’s quality and productivity this year. We have increased the number of partnerships in the area over the past year to address the changing certification rules for next year.

Contributions to the Institution
The MEd program in educational leadership has served as a symbol of quality and service in the Atlanta area. School districts often comment about leaders coming from our program and how they can assume the leaders will be highly competent and prepared.

Highlights
This year in educational leadership the unit worked diligently to redesign the program including a re-envisioning of our relationship within the university and our responsibilities to the Atlanta community.

Challenges
The unit will face tremendous challenges in the next few years regarding identity, capacity, and the degree to which we can serve in the new certification arena. We currently do not have the staff nor the organizational structure to adequately support more than one or two partnerships for certification in the future. This is further complicated by the fact that districts may or may not have much need for certification services for the next year to five years. Because the master’s L-5 add-on courses are no longer required for leadership certification, we may struggle with future plans. It is possible (and even likely) that we will see a significant decline in the number of applicants at the master’s level in educational leadership. It is also very likely that we will no longer have districts seeking cohort services at the master’s level.

Teaching Activities
Our unit has made great gains shifting from traditional assessments to performance based assessments in educational leadership. We are also exploring alternative forms of delivery.

Research and Scholarly Activities
The leadership unit plans to initiate more specific efforts for program evaluation as we transition to the redesigned program next year.

Public/Community Service
The educational leadership unit has worked to involve community members - both in our redesign and in teaching courses for us. Further, we have been visible and active in a number of state-level meetings (GLISI, PSC, etc.) regarding the new certification rules for leadership.

International Activities
The leadership unit continues to support the England Abroad program for its students.

Georgia State University
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2006-2007 Educational Policy Studies PhD
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(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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Critically Evaluates Literature (M: 1)**

Student has demonstrated the ability to critique, summarize, and interpret the findings from published research and scholarship.

**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 2: Interprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts (M: 3)**

Student has demonstrated a knowledge base of resources, theories, distinctions, and analytic techniques developed within the humanities, social sciences, and the foundations of education.

**Relevant Associations:** Principle #1 of the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation for the Council of Social Foundations of Education

**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: Conducts Scholarly Research (M: 2)**

Student has demonstrated the ability to (a) explain principles underlying qualitative and quantitative research; or (b) 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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Research Core Requirements/Cohort Policy Sequence (O: 1)**

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 assignments 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: Critically Evaluates Literature**

95% of students met or exceed expectations, as evaluated by program faculty in EPRS 8500 & 8530, and EPS 9270.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Forty-nine students met or exceeded the outcomes in assignments that critically evaluate literature and review articles.

**M 2: Research Track/Prospectus & Dissertation Defense (O: 3)**

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 assignments 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". For prospectus or dissertation defense a pass was awarded 2(met) or 1(failed).

**Target for O3: Conducts Scholarly Research**

95% of students meet or exceed expectations, as evaluated by program faculty in EPSF 9280. 95% of students passed their prospectus or dissertation defense on the first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Seven students exceeded outcomes with assignments of a research proposal with ten subsections resulting in a publishable article or pilot study for the dissertation. One student passed the prospectus and one student passed the defense.

**M 3: Social Foundations Core Requirements (O: 2)**

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 assignments a score of 1 was given for a grade below "C," 2 for a
grade of "C"; and 3 for a grade of "A" or "B".

**Target for O2: Intreprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts**

95% of students meet or exceed expectations, as evaluated by program faculty in EPSF 8270, 8310 & 8320.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Forty-four students exceeded outcomes based upon the following assignments: philosophy positions, issues papers, and book reports.

**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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPS faculty

**Shows Annual Growth and Development as a Scholar**

As first-year doctoral students progress from introductory courses to advanced courses, and as students taking advanced courses progress to the comprehensive exam, the development of a prospectus, and the completion of a dissertation, we will continue to gather assessment information from these students for the named learning outcomes. For students who are at least meeting the standards for success early in the program, our goal is to do what we can to help them to continue to succeed throughout the program. For students who are initially not meeting the standards, our goal is to help them to develop into successful doctoral students. Continuing to assess the learning outcomes for each student throughout the doctoral program will help us to determine whether we are achieving these goals. At this time, we do not yet have sufficient data to address annual growth and development, but the data we collect in 2007 will allow us to evaluate progress for our returning students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Research Core Requirements/Cohort Policy Sequence | **Outcome/Objective:** Critically Evaluates Literature
- **Measure:** Research Track/Prospectus & Dissertation Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Conducts Scholarly Research
- **Measure:** Social Foundations Core Requirements | **Outcome/Objective:** Intreprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts

- **Implementation Description:** May, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPS Program Coordinators

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Students met or exceeded the three named outcomes and objectives. No further action is planned except to monitor and maintain current levels of performance.

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

The EPS department will begin to track longitudinally student-level data for evidence of annual growth and development as a scholar.
**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 41 students in the MS program. There were 10 graduates during the 2006-2007 academic year (Fall through Spring semesters).

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year 100% (n=10) students successfully completed the written and oral components of the comps.

**Target for O2: Apply research methods**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year 100% (n=10) students successfully completed the written and oral components of the comps.
Target for O4: Participates in scholarly activities
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the past academic year 100% (n=10) students successfully completed the written and oral components 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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

Clarity requirements for masters thesis research
The Master’s Handbook in Educational Psychology will be revised to more clearly present requirements for master’s thesis research.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply research methods |
| Participates in scholarly activities |

Implementation Description: Summer, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty members in Educational Psychology

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?
Student Handbook will be revised to more clearly indicate requirements for thesis research.
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 30 students in the Ph.D. program. There were 6 graduates during the 2006-2007 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
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O6: Demonstrates competence in teaching
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 24 students received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better on their evaluation. Four received an unsatisfactory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods
All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally
All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3: Teaching Internship (O: 6)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the 2006-2007 academic year, all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the past year, 6 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.</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 their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully complete the professional development seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| During the 2006-2007 academic year, a total of over 40 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or
Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the 2006-2007 academic year, a total of over 40 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the 2006-2007 academic year, a total of over 40 publications, presentations, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the 2006-2007 academic year, a total of over 40 publications, presentations, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the 2006-2007 academic year, a total of over 40 publications, presentations, 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

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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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
Program faculty will continue to carefully monitor students' performance during the year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Educational Research MS
As of 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to provide high-quality, relevant and useful training in qualitative and quantitative research methods, program evaluation, testing, and computer applications to all students in the College of Education and to serve the needs of external stakeholders, including local school districts, state educational and social service agencies and policy makers.

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

O/O 2: Analyze data and report on the results (M: 1, 2, 4, 6)
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

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

O/O 3: Review and critique the research literature (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)
Be able to write a review of an article in a professional journal.

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

O/O 4: Design a research study (M: 1, 4)
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

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
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Course assessment: Write a Method section (O: 2, 4)**

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.

#### Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two students wrote proposed Method sections as part of research proposals submitted as a course assessment, and both students met/exceeded the standard of quality.

#### Target for O4: Design a research study

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two students wrote proposed Method sections as part of research proposals submitted as a course assessment, and both students met/exceeded the standard of quality.

**M 2: Course assessment: Write a Results section (O: 2)**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

There were four assessments of students’ ability to report the results of statistical analyses, and all were at/above the standard of quality.

**M 3: Course assessment: Article review (O: 3)**

Students will write multiple article reviews, with high quality 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Three students wrote article reviews as part of coursework, and all three met/exceeded the standard of quality.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully completed this task.

#### Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully completed this task.

#### Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully completed this task.

#### Target for O4: Design a research study

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students successfully completed this task.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Two students wrote literature reviews as part of research proposals submitted as a course assessment, and both students met/exceeded the standard of quality.

Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature
100% of students earn the equivalent of an “A” on the assessment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Two students wrote literature reviews as part of research proposals submitted as a course assessment, and both students met/exceeded the standard of quality.

M 6: Synthesize information (O: 2, 3)
Students will be able to synthesize information from a minimum of three research articles on a common subject and draw conclusions based on the synthesis.

Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results
100% of students will reach proficiency on this measure.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
No students were in the sample for this measure in Fall 2006

Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature
100% of students will reach proficiency on this measure.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
No students were in the sample for this measure in Fall 2006

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: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query
  | 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
Collect and report data from Fall '06 PTIs/GTAs
We will be asking those PTIs and GTAs who taught for us in Fall 2006 for LOA data. We will then update the Fall 2006 report as those data come available.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a Method section | Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results
- Design a research study

Implementation Description: August 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator, PTIs, and GTAs

Improve data collection procedure
Our initial plan was to request data from only the EPRS faculty members, but it seems that we need also to collect LOA data from the PTIs and GTAs who teach our courses. In Fall 2006, very few of our 7000-level and lower-8000-level courses were being taught by faculty, so we may have lost Fall 2006 LOA data that way. For future LOA reporting, we will request data from those instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a Method section | Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results
- Design a research study

Implementation Description: Effective immediately
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator, PTIs, and GTAs

Review the list of objectives and measures
Measures 6, “Synthesize information” is vague, and as a measure, it seems not to contribute anything unique beyond what is assessed via literature review(Measure 1) and Results sections(Measure 4). Furthermore, we do not recall developing/listing it as a measure. We will consider the specific intention of Measure 6 to determine whether it seems to have the potential to contribute something unique; if it does not, then it will be removed as a measure, but it might be added as a learning objective, as none of the learning objectives themselves seem to speak directly to the notion of synthesis. We will also review the other objectives and measures, and we will make any additions/deletions/changes that seem warranted.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query
- Measure: Course assessment: Write a Method section | Outcome/Objective: Analyze data and report on the results
- Design a research study

Implementation Description: End of Fall 2007 semester
Responsible Person/Group: The Educational Research unit

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We have insufficient data from Fall 2006 to make any meaningful claim about the effectiveness of our program in developing the skills highlighted in the learning outcomes. Because Fall 2006 was the first semester of data collection, no inference can be made about the efficacy of our current approach to assessing the learning outcomes, beyond the need to collect data from all of our EPRS course instructors. If, after inquiring with them, there is still very little data, and the paucity of data becomes a trend, then we will need to explore other avenues of assessing our learning outcomes. For now, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that our advanced master's students had taken all of the EPRS courses they needed but were not yet registered for thesis/project work, while our beginning master's students may have been taking non-EPRS courses. Two advanced students were working on their project or thesis in Spring 2007, and another has registered for the master's project in Summer 2007. Also, a number of master's students who were admitted for Fall 2006 deferred to Spring or Summer of 2007, making it quite likely that no beginning master's students were taking EPRS courses in Fall 2006. Again, we will need to attempt to acquire data from our PTIs and GTAs from Fall 2006 in order to gather more assessment data or in order to claim for certain that we simply had a low number of master's students enrolled in EPRS courses in Fall 2006.
# 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
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.

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 instructions: 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.

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.

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.

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>SLO 16: Knowledge of chosen genre</th>
<th>(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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 17: Applying literary studies to creative writing (M: 7, 8)</th>
<th>(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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Ability to produce effective literary works (M: 7, 8)</th>
<th>(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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 19: Ability to revise literary works effectively (M: 7, 8)</th>
<th>(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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Critical Thinking--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric (M: 5, 9)</th>
<th>(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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SLO 21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric (M: 5, 9)        | |
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

### SLO 24: Collaboration--Core (M: 10)

Collaboration in the English classroom occurs when students work together in small groups on projects, presentations, peer review, workshop settings, etc. This outcome for learning was defined during the 2006-07 academic year through the following criteria: Contribution (research & gathering information, sharing information, punctuality), Responsibility (fulfilling team role’s duties, participation, sharing equally), Valuing Others’ Viewpoints (listening to others, cooperating with teammates, making fair decisions), and Product (the written or oral articulation of collaborative work). These categories and their sub-categories describe aspects of collaboration that we focused on with students in the Core.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

#### 6 Collaboration--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

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.
**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**
The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

The 2006-2007 report recommended increased attention given to students’ scores in research and documentation. (Because of this, one of the major points of discussion at the meeting of faculty who teach the senior seminar had to do with the teaching of research.) The 2005-2006 report also called for a revision of the senior seminar sheets for the Literature concentration to reflect more of the general education learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on the literature concentration indicates, the scores for research and documentation in the senior seminar were somewhat inconsistent, as one class’s scores were 3.9, another class’ scores were 4.2, and a third class’ were 4.5. Otherwise, this year’s results showed increases in seven categories while three categories either remained the same or decreased by only .1.

**M 2: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15)**

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**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education learning outcomes. 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.
education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.
Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

Target for O12: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

Target for O13: Knowledge of English Education profession

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall
scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**Target for O15: Ability to reflect upon/revise teaching practices**

The 2005-2006 report indicated the need to revise the assessment sheets for the portfolios to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for a review of the criterion concerning Knowledge of Language and Linguistics since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolios suggests, the scores from 2006-2007 on the departmental assessment forms for this concentration range from 3.9 to 4.6 and from 4.1 to 5.0 on the student assessment form. Over three years of data, the overall scores have remained quite consistent, suggesting the students have generally mastered the goal of the secondary English program as outlined in the learning outcomes. Students also scored well on the newly added criterion concerning the Ability to Engage with Contemporary/Global issues. The category concerning the Knowledge of Language and Linguistics received adequate scores (4.3 overall), even though faculty members continued to be uncertain of the parameters of this criterion.

**M 3: Senior Seminar in Secondary English (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)**

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 (median scores are also being calculated as of the 2007-2008 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**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to comprehend texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to think critically and to interpret texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to create effective written communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to engage in effective oral communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to use research effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O10:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O12:</strong></td>
<td>The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O13: Knowledge of English Education Profession

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

Target for O14: Ability to Teach Effectively

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

Target for O15: Ability to Reflect Upon/Revise Teaching Practices

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated the need to add more general education learning outcomes to the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As reflected in the hyperlinked data on the senior seminars, all overall scores for the senior seminar in this concentration were 4.0 or higher, except for ratings of a 3.8 in the criterion on the Ability to Understand Literary Criticism, a 3.9 in Effective Oral Communication, a 3.8 in the ability to reflect upon and revise teaching, and a 3.7 in the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision.

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. 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

Students will achieve an average of 4 or better (good to excellent) on a scale of 1 to 6 (a score of 1 indicating poor quality through a score of 6 indicating excellence) on each measure and on the total score.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The assessment for the Written Communication learning outcome in the Core indicates that students in the Core in English classes demonstrate written communication skills at a level of 4.16 out of 6.0 (20.8 out of a possible 30 points total, or 69% overall). Thirty-seven instructors completed the revised rubric on Assessing Writing with 1025 students. Specific rubric criteria averaged 4.5 on Ideas, 4.1 on Organization, 4.2 on Development, 4.0 on Style and Mechanics, and 4.0 on Format. Five percent of students had an overall rating at the upper level of the rubric, the 6th level that measures student writing as excellent. The majority of students scored in the mid-range with 26% of students scoring at the 5th level, 39% at the 4th level and 26% at the 3rd level. Only 2% of student writing was rated at the level of 2 and none at level 1. Although the averages calculated in the 4 range, the individual ratings varied, especially in the area of format. On that criterion, students ranged most widely, and their writing tended to be rated as either 2/3 or 5/6 - they either understood and performed this skill well or they didn’t. In addition, other categories, like Development and Organization, while they included a range from 2 to 6, most scores were 4s and 5s with a few 3s and only two scores of 6. Style and Mechanics ranged from 2 to 5, with no instructors rating student writing as a 6 in this area and most of the ratings as 4, which indicates that the writing is readable and rhetorically effective, but that there are still errors in usage, spelling, and punctuation. This data indicates that we need to continue working on mechanics and format, along with organization, development, and ideas.

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 plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.
### Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rhetorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

---

### Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the
Target for **O10: Ability to use research effectively**

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rheorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

Target for **O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rheorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

Target for **O20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric**

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rheorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

Target for **O21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric**

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rheorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

Target for **O22: Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric**

The assessment plan for 2005-2006 included the intention of revising the portfolio assessment forms for this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, faculty intended to reconsider research expectations in the senior seminar and the expectations surrounding the Knowledge of a Variety of Writing Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked data, all scores on the senior seminar in this concentration were a 4.2 or higher, except for the Knowledge of Rheorical Theory and the Ability to Write Using a Variety of Writing Technologies.

### M6: 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 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 being tabulated and recorded as of the 2007-2008 assessment 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**

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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 O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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

An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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
An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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
An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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 O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues
An action outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report was to include more of the general education learning outcomes in the assessment form for the Literature concentration. Another goal was to achieve at least a 4.2 in category devoted to the Knowledge of Critical Theory, an area of weakness in the previous year.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked data on portfolio assessment scores 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.)

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
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to
reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn't been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn't been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn't been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn't been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn't been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty's objectives more directly than past drafts did.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year's scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.
reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty’s objectives more directly than past drafts did.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

**Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty’s objectives more directly than past drafts did.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

**Target for O17: Applying literary studies to creative writing**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty’s objectives more directly than past drafts did.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

**Target for O18: Ability to produce effective literary works**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty’s objectives more directly than past drafts did.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.

**Target for O19: Ability to revise literary works effectively**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses (the ideal cap for a creative writing class is 15), but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty will reiterate that need for the next year. The creative writing faculty also revised the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, and the sheets now seem to reflect the faculty’s objectives more directly than past drafts did.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As indicated in the portfolio data in the hypertext, scores on the portfolios in this concentration ranged from a 4.0 to a 4.5, with the exception of one ranking of 3.8 for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing in the summer of 06. These scores reveal an increase in all categories over previous years, with the exception of the criterion on Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics which remained the same as the 05-06 overall score. This year’s scores also showed nearly complete consistency between the student forms and the department forms.
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**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

**Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**
In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were be to instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O9: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O17: Applying literary studies to creative writing

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O18: Ability to produce effective literary works

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

### Target for O19: Ability to revise literary works effectively

In the 2005-2006 assessment report, the forms for the senior seminar were to be revised to incorporated more of the general education outcomes. In addition, students were to be instructed to give more attention to basic mechanics in their work since this was identified as an area of weakness in the senior seminar results for that year.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As indicated in the portfolio data on the hyperlink, scores for the senior seminar in this concentration show considerable improvement, with some categories showing an increase of as much as .7. The scores for Grammatically and Syntactically Sound Writing reflected a .3 increase over the previous year.

#### M 9: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 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
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O3: Knowledge of literary terms
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O4: Knowledge of language and linguistics
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O5: Knowledge of criticism and theory
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O6: Ability to comprehend texts
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

### Target for O7: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O8: Ability to create effective written communications**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O10: Ability to use research effectively**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O11: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O20: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O21: Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**Target for O22: Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric**

The 2005-2006 assessment plan indicated intentions to revise the portfolio assessment forms in this concentration to include more of the general education outcomes. In addition, the plan called for broader participation in the reading of portfolios on the
part of faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition section. Finally, this concentration intended to give more attention to the
criterion concerning the Ability to Write with Various Technologies.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

As indicated in the hyperlinked information on the data from the portfolios, the scores on the department form of the portfolios
in this concentration ranged from 3.8 to 4.8 while the student forms included scores ranging from 3.8 to 5.0. The lowest
scores were in the Knowledge and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write with a Variety of Technologies. Over three years
of data, the scores on the portfolios have tended to decrease slightly or to remain the same.

**M 10: Collaboration (O: 24)**

Collaboration was defined through small group projects and presentations as well as small group peer review of writing. Group sizes
averaged 4 to 5 students. During the academic year 2006-07, 29 instructors used a collaboration rubric (see Outcome Description)to
measure 4 major categories with 3 sub-categories to measure student learning in this area in English courses in the Core (1000 and
2000 level English courses). The results are a compilation of scores from 926 students.

**Target for O24: Collaboration—Core**

Students will receive scores of at least 3 (accomplished) and some 4’s (exemplary) across the 4 categories of Beginning,
Developing, Accomplished, and Exemplary for each of the criteria listed above.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors who completed the rubric on Collaboration rated students as having met the criteria for Accomplished when all
scores were averaged (33.6 out of a possible total score of 40 or 84%). Individually, the sub-category scores ranged from 1 to
4 on a scale of 1 to 4. The data indicates that we need to work with students on learning to be punctual, share equally, and
learn to make fair decisions as they work in groups on projects or with peer review. These criteria received the lowest average
scores among the data (3.2). The higher average scores of 3.5 indicate that students participate in class presentations and
discussion, and listen to others well. Finally, instructors rated cooperation with teammates as 3.6, the highest rating on the
rubric. None of the categories on the rubric averaged a score of 4 (Exemplary) though a few instructors rated their students
as Exemplary in one or two of the sub-category areas.

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

**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

**Broden 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 create effective written communications
  - **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 Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts
  - Ability to create effective written communications | Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to produce effective literary works | Ability to revise literary works effectively | Ability to think critically and to interpret 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

- Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts
  - 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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

- Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts
  - 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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

Implementation Description: May 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman

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):
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

Review 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

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

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
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 conducted 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
**Consider on-line assessment forms**

The department will consider the possibility of placing assessment forms for the portfolio and the senior seminar on line in order to have more immediate feedback, to achieve greater accuracy in data collection, and to create multiple approaches for looking at the data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  | Measure: Senior Ext Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  |  
|  |  | Ability to create effective written communications |  
|  |  | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |  
| 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Completed  
**Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  | Measure: Written Communication Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication--Core |  
|  |  |  

**Collaboration - Core**

This data on collaboration in the core indicates that we should address the general issues of Contribution and Product as we encourage students to learn to work together effectively. In addition, we will need to work on specific objectives within this learning outcome including punctuality, sharing in the duties of group work, and understanding what making fair decisions entails. Because there were several questions from the instructors about how to measure student learning through this rubric, we will revisit the rubric itself in order to try to capture collaborative skills more specifically and more accurately. In addition, during the 2007-08 academic year, the Director of Lower Division Studies, who supervises instructors of most of the Core courses in English, will focus several workshops and seminars on this topic during the teaching conferences sponsored by the Division.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  | Measure: Collaboration | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration--Core  
|  |  |  

| Measure: Senior Ext Portfolios in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  
|  |  | Ability to create effective written communications |  
|  |  | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues |  
|  |  | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |  
| Implementation Description: | Spring 2008 |  
| Responsible Person/Group: | Marti Singer |  

| Measure: Senior Ext Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  
|  |  | Ability to create effective written communications |  
|  |  | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues |  
|  |  | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |  

**Consider on-line assessment forms**

The department will consider the possibility of placing assessment forms for the portfolio and the senior seminar on line in order to have more immediate feedback, to achieve greater accuracy in data collection, and to create multiple approaches for looking at the data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  | Measure: Senior Ext Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  
|  |  | 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 |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |  

| Measure: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  
|  |  | Ability to create effective written communications |  
|  |  | Ability to engage in effective oral communication |  
|  |  | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |  

| Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts  
|  |  | Ability to create effective written communications |  
|  |  | Ability to engage in effective oral communication |  
|  |  | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts |  
|  |  | Ability to use research effectively |  
|  |  | 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 |
Continue senior seminar faculty meetings

Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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

Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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

Implementations: October 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment coordinator and technical consultant

Additional Resources: Technicians for the English department would need to create a system for storing and tabulating the on-line assessment forms.

Continue discussion about language (Second English)

For the secondary English concentration Faculty members will continue discussion in the Secondary English committee about the way to determine knowledge of language and linguistics in the review of the portfolios.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure | Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of language and linguistics |

Implementation Description: January 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Chair of the Secondary English Committee

Continue discussion on writing technologies (R/C)

For Rhetoric and Composition Faculty need to continue to discuss the expectation for writing technologies in the portfolio of this concentration. This criterion received the lowest scores, suggesting that students and perhaps faculty are not certain of the meaning of this outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure | Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications | Ability to use research effectively | Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric |

Implementation Description: January 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Continue senior seminar faculty meetings

Previous meetings of faculty who teach the senior seminars, run by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, have proven to be very useful in defining the course, suggesting activities, and discussing the role of research in this capstone course. Topics included strategies for teaching research, types of assignments, and strategies for professionalism. Suggestions were shared with the entire faculty at the fall faculty meeting to incorporate some of these skills in their upper-level classes. Seminars taught the following semester paid particular attention to issues of conducting research and incorporating many sources into a nuanced argument in the course research papers. The department will continue to hold regular meetings so that faculty can keep improving the course and sharing experiences with colleagues who are new to the course. These conversations will also address the CTW initiatives.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure | Senior Seminar in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | Ability to create effective written communications | Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Implementation Description: Fall 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Decide about withdrawals/failures in s. seminars

One problem with assessing student work in the senior seminar is that students who fail this course can throw off class averages on the learning outcomes, if their scores are added to the scores of other students. In the past, faculty have either factored their scores

| Measure | Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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 |

Implementation Description: Fall 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Decide about withdrawals/failures in s. seminars

One problem with assessing student work in the senior seminar is that students who fail this course can throw off class averages on the learning outcomes, if their scores are added to the scores of other students. In the past, faculty have either factored their scores
in or given them a score of "can’t determine." The faculty needs to discuss how to handle these failures and to create a consistent policy.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

### Delay due date of portfolio (Creative Writing)

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Senior Seminar in Creative Writing  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to comprehend texts  
  - Ability to create effective written communications  
  - Ability to engage in effective oral communication  
  - Ability to think critically and to interpret texts  
  - Ability to use research effectively  
  - 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  

**Measure:** Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to comprehend texts  
- 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  
- Ability to use research effectively  
- 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

**Measure:** Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to comprehend texts  
- 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  
- Ability to use research effectively  
- 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

**Measure:** Senior Seminar in Secondary English  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to comprehend texts  
- 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  
- Ability to use research effectively  
- 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

**Implementation Description:** October 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and faculty

### Form a standing committee on assessment

Previously, assessment work was organized by the Assessment coordinator who worked in conjunction with concentration heads. In 2007-2008, the department will create a standing committee on assessment so will review and revise assessment documents and forms, analyze assessment results, and discuss topics surrounding assessment that are raised in department meetings and other contexts (for example, the discussion about research that has been raised as a point of discussion on many occasions in the past few years.)

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Delay due date of portfolio (Creative Writing)

**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:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing
and to interpret texts | Ability to use research effectively | 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
Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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
Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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
Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts | 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 | Ability to use research effectively | 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

Implementation Description: October 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Additional Resources: Since approximately eight faculty members will serve on this committee (two from each concentration), this will require faculty service time.

Institute CTW courses in pilot program
During spring 2007, an ad-hoc committee made up of eight English faculty members met on five occasions to discuss ideas for instituting CTW into the English department’s gateway courses (2140 and 2150) and capstone courses (4300, 4310, 4320, and 4330). A limited number of CTW classes will be run as a pilot program in spring 2008. Faculty on this committee have stressed the need to make CTW activities an integral part of course work so that these activities contribute to students’ mastery of all the learning outcomes. Using CTW in the gateway courses will provide important information about these courses which mark the starting point of the program since the department has not yet created any assessment measures, other than grades, for these classes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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
Measure: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Lower Division Studies
Additional Resources: Considerable attention needs to be given to design CTW courses and to train faculty in the value and use of CTW courses.

Press for smaller classes (Creative Writing)
(for the Creative Writing Concentration) As discussed in the previous section, last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing sections, which employ pedagogical strategies that require much more extensive teacher-student interaction than those in literature courses, but that need hasn’t been met yet, so the creative writing faculty reiterates that need for the next year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing faculty

Revise Learning Outcomes (R/C)
(for Rhetoric/Composition Concentration) Faculty in this concentration will revise the Rhetoric/Composition learning outcomes so that they provide a more comprehensive reflection of the knowledge and skills covered in this program, rather than providing such a strong emphasis on the mastery of technology, as is the case with the present learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric | Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric | Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric
Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the history of rhetoric | Knowledge of the practice of rhetoric | Knowledge of the theory of rhetoric

Implementation Description: October 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Set target for the Knowledge of Rhetoric (R/C)
(for the Rhetoric and Composition concentration) Rhetoric and Composition faculty will set a target of 4.2 for the criterion concerning the Knowledge of the Language and History of Rhetoric on the portfolio assessment form and for the Knowledge of Rhetoric Theory
on the senior seminar assessment forms.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The portfolio assessment process for all four concentrations went more smoothly than in previous years. More faculty members were readers of portfolios, especially in the literature concentration. Another significant assistance for assessment was the senior seminar sessions that are proving to have a reverberating effect on the way faculty teach this course. Portfolio results in the Literature concentration were quite favorable this year. They demonstrated overall strength in all areas and improvement in many compared to previous years. With scores in all categories ranging from 4.0 to 4.6, students continue to display strong achievement, especially in the clarity with which they present their work and the ability to communicate and use research. It is encouraging that the research scores continue to rise, suggesting that the discussions about research raised in department meetings and at the senior seminar sessions are having an effect on curriculum. Many new faculty members read portfolios this year, and we hope that spreading the responsibility for assessment will encourage faculty to address in their courses the weaknesses they might note in the portfolios. The results from the senior seminar classes in this concentration also show strength and improvement. The senior seminar taught in the spring 2007 had substantially higher scores regarding the research project and the ability to use information technology, again offering proof that the senior seminar sessions in the fall were effective. In the Creative Writing Concentration, faculty members differ in terms of the emphasis they hope to give to scoring basic mechanics in creative writing courses (some of the faculty argues that basic skills should be taught and evaluated in other courses), but all the same this criterion was emphasized on the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, with the result of higher overall scores in that area than in previous years. The 2006-2007 student sheet results generally reflect the same scores as the departmental sheets, suggesting that scorers are attending to consistency between forms. In the Knowledge of Vocabulary section and the Evidence of Revision sections, the student forms reflected slightly higher scores than the departmental forms, perhaps because the scorers were intending to give students positive feedback while remaining more candid on departmental forms (our understanding is that the purpose of having two forms is to be more positive for students and more frank for the department). Over the last three years, the numbers generally rose, which suggests that students and professors are attending to these criteria as they work to meet them. However, the percentages of scores in the 5/6 range have also increased over the last three scoring periods. This improvement is partly due to some of the professors' explicit discussion about the criteria early in the seminar, so that students focus on the criteria throughout the course of the semester. Further, the criteria on the 2006-2007 sheets better articulate the goals of the creative writing Senior Seminars than did earlier drafts of the forms, so the rubrics now more naturally assess the skills valued in the seminars. Results for the portfolio in the Secondary English concentration are quite encouraging, showing general improvement in scores. The senior seminar scores for this concentration were quite favorable this year. They demonstrated overall strength in all areas and improvement in many compared to previous years. With scores in all categories ranging from 4.0 to 4.6, students continue to display strong achievement, especially in the clarity with which they present their work and the ability to communicate and use research. It is encouraging that the research scores continue to rise, suggesting that the discussions about research raised in department meetings and at the senior seminar sessions are having an effect on curriculum. Many new faculty members read portfolios this year, and we hope that spreading the responsibility for assessment will encourage faculty to address in their courses the weaknesses they might note in the portfolios. The results from the senior seminar classes in this concentration also show strength and improvement. The senior seminar taught in the spring 2007 had substantially higher scores regarding the research project and the ability to use information technology, again offering proof that the senior seminar sessions in the fall were effective. In the Creative Writing Concentration, faculty members differ in terms of the emphasis they hope to give to scoring basic mechanics in creative writing courses (some of the faculty argues that basic skills should be taught and evaluated in other courses), but all the same this criterion was emphasized on the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, with the result of higher overall scores in that area than in previous years. The 2006-2007 student sheet results generally reflect the same scores as the departmental sheets, suggesting that scorers are attending to consistency between forms. In the Knowledge of Vocabulary section and the Evidence of Revision sections, the student forms reflected slightly higher scores than the departmental forms, perhaps because the scorers were intending to give students positive feedback while remaining more candid on departmental forms (our understanding is that the purpose of having two forms is to be more positive for students and more frank for the department). Over the last three years, the numbers generally rose, which suggests that students and professors are attending to these criteria as they work to meet them. However, the percentages of scores in the 5/6 range have also increased over the last three scoring periods. This improvement is partly due to some of the professors' explicit discussion about the criteria early in the seminar, so that students focus on the criteria throughout the course of the semester. Further, the criteria on the 2006-2007 sheets better articulate the goals of the creative writing Senior Seminars than did earlier drafts of the forms, so the rubrics now more naturally assess the skills valued in the seminars. Results for the portfolio in the Secondary English concentration are quite encouraging, showing general improvement in scores. The senior seminar scores for this concentration were quite favorable this year. They demonstrated overall strength in all areas and improvement in many compared to previous years. With scores in all categories ranging from 4.0 to 4.6, students continue to display strong achievement, especially in the clarity with which they present their work and the ability to communicate and use research. It is encouraging that the research scores continue to rise, suggesting that the discussions about research raised in department meetings and at the senior seminar sessions are having an effect on curriculum. Many new faculty members read portfolios this year, and we hope that spreading the responsibility for assessment will encourage faculty to address in their courses the weaknesses they might note in the portfolios. The results from the senior seminar classes in this concentration also show strength and improvement. The senior seminar taught in the spring 2007 had substantially higher scores regarding the research project and the ability to use information technology, again offering proof that the senior seminar sessions in the fall were effective. In the Creative Writing Concentration, faculty members differ in terms of the emphasis they hope to give to scoring basic mechanics in creative writing courses (some of the faculty argues that basic skills should be taught and evaluated in other courses), but all the same this criterion was emphasized on the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, with the result of higher overall scores in that area than in previous years. The 2006-2007 student sheet results generally reflect the same scores as the departmental sheets, suggesting that scorers are attending to consistency between forms. In the Knowledge of Vocabulary section and the Evidence of Revision sections, the student forms reflected slightly higher scores than the departmental forms, perhaps because the scorers were intending to give students positive feedback while remaining more candid on departmental forms (our understanding is that the purpose of having two forms is to be more positive for students and more frank for the department). Over the last three years, the numbers generally rose, which suggests that students and professors are attending to these criteria as they work to meet them. However, the percentages of scores in the 5/6 range have also increased over the last three scoring periods. This improvement is partly due to some of the professors' explicit discussion about the criteria early in the seminar, so that students focus on the criteria throughout the course of the semester. Further, the criteria on the 2006-2007 sheets better articulate the goals of the creative writing Senior Seminars than did earlier drafts of the forms, so the rubrics now more naturally assess the skills valued in the seminars. Results for the portfolio in the Secondary English concentration are quite encouraging, showing general improvement in scores. The senior seminar scores for this concentration were quite favorable this year. They demonstrated overall strength in all areas and improvement in many compared to previous years. With scores in all categories ranging from 4.0 to 4.6, students continue to display strong achievement, especially in the clarity with which they present their work and the ability to communicate and use research. It is encouraging that the research scores continue to rise, suggesting that the discussions about research raised in department meetings and at the senior seminar sessions are having an effect on curriculum. Many new faculty members read portfolios this year, and we hope that spreading the responsibility for assessment will encourage faculty to address in their courses the weaknesses they might note in the portfolios. The results from the senior seminar classes in this concentration also show strength and improvement. The senior seminar taught in the spring 2007 had substantially higher scores regarding the research project and the ability to use information technology, again offering proof that the senior seminar sessions in the fall were effective. In the Creative Writing Concentration, faculty members differ in terms of the emphasis they hope to give to scoring basic mechanics in creative writing courses (some of the faculty argues that basic skills should be taught and evaluated in other courses), but all the same this criterion was emphasized on the Senior Portfolio Assessment Sheets, with the result of higher overall scores in that area than in previous years. The 2006-2007 student sheet results generally reflect the same scores as the departmental sheets, suggesting that scorers are attending to consistency between forms. In the Knowledge of Vocabulary section and the Evidence of Revision sections, the student forms reflected slightly higher scores than the departmental forms, perhaps because the scorers were intending to give students positive feedback while remaining more candid on departmental forms (our understanding is that the purpose of having two forms is to be more positive for students and more frank for the department). Over the last three years, the numbers generally rose, which suggests that students and professors are attending to these criteria as they work to meet them. However, the percentages of scores in the 5/6 range have also increased over the last three scoring periods. This improvement is partly due to some of the professors' explicit discussion about the criteria early in the seminar, so that students focus on the criteria throughout the course of the semester. Further, the criteria on the 2006-2007 sheets better articulate the goals of the creative writing Senior Seminars than did earlier drafts of the forms, so the rubrics now more naturally assess the skills valued in the seminars. Results for the portfolio in the Secondary English concentration are quite encouraging, showing general improvement in scores. The senior seminar scores for this concentration were
less promising. Two factors seem to have contributed to that trend. First, scores of failing students were factors into the class scores for the fall 2006 senior seminar. Second, the assessment form itself has proven to be overly detailed. Having so many criteria on the form has caused faculty to be less critical in their scoring. Scores for the assessment measures in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration have decreased slightly, unlike the increasing trend in the other concentrations. While this may seem discouraging, faculty in this concentration see this trend as an indicator that they are becoming more accustomed to the evaluation process and are reading student materials more critically than in previous years when the scores were so high and likely somewhat inflated. But there are two major areas within this downward trend that do cause concern: the Knowledge of the Language and History of Rhetoric and the Ability to Write within Various Writing Technologies. The first area should not be a problem point since the teaching of rhetoric is one of the strengths of this concentration. The second area of weakness is more understandable as it stems, generally speaking, from a split in this concentration between faculty members who are more interested in the theory of rhetoric than in the practice of it. One group is not as technologically oriented as the other, and consequently, there are varying opinions about the types of technological knowledge are needed for success in the program. Compared to last year’s assessment, the data on the Written Communication in the Core indicates a more balanced bell curve, rather than the split results we had last year (high and low, but little middle). These new results could be considered good, but we are looking to move the average scores toward the upper end of the rubric toward levels of excellence. We think that we probably did a better job assessing the skills associated with writing this year, and we had a much larger pool of students and instructors this time. This year’s assessment also used a revised rubric which seemed to measure specific skills of written communication more accurately. The agreement across instructors was higher than last year as well. Students seem to be making progress on focusing their ideas, stating their purpose and thesis more clearly, and audience awareness. Scores on development were higher this time as well. This is the first year we assessed Collaboration in the Core with a formal rubric. Earlier assessments on Collaboration looked at the kinds of group projects or group work included in courses in the English Core, rather than a measure of student learning in this area. We made progress then, this year, with our first attempt at actually breaking down the skills and activities that help assess student learning with collaboration.

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

A concern for the senior seminar assessment in all four concentrations came up when a number of senior seminars had problems with student withdrawals or failures greatly diminishing the overall average. So it is important that the department create a policy about how to reflect the work of these students in the senior assessment tool without allowing the poor grades to skew the results. While there are no areas of obvious weakness that the assessment tools have revealed about student performance in the Literature concentration, it is worth noting that the two lowest scores on the student assessment form of the literature portfolio are grammar/syntax and consistency. These areas should be given additional attention in the upcoming year. Most significantly, the Secondary English concentration needs to revise its senior seminar assessment form by collapsing many criteria to make for a shorter and more holistic evaluation. Also, faculty members in this concentration need to discuss more thoroughly their expectations about language and linguistics. If this criterion is deemed significant enough, then students should be required to include a paper about language and/or linguistics as one of the pieces of evidence in their portfolios. Without this requirement, it is difficult to determine all students’ level of knowledge in this area. The faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration will give specific attention to the two problem areas listed above during the 2007-2008 year. Additionally, they will make greater efforts to divide the work of assessment more evenly, a goal that was also set in 2006 but never fully addressed. In terms of the Written Communication in the Core, we need to continue to try to define what we mean by Style and Mechanics. That category covers sentence structure, grammar, spelling, and punctuation. We may need to break that category into smaller ones and look closely to define areas students are having trouble with. The same issue holds for the category of Format. We will work on these this next year. For collaboration in the Core, we will continue to refine the new rubric to meet the goals of our courses, including finding ways to help students share equally as they work together. Aspects of the rubric that capture attitudes indicate that students are comfortable in small groups and in peer editing situations, but we will need to figure out ways to help them with getting their work done on time and think carefully through decisions that affect them and their peers.
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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. 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
O/O 9: Increase Publicity in English Ed M.Ed.
Program will work to increase the number of applicants to their English Ed M.Ed. and the number of students admitted to the program.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 Know Eng Grammars (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 1 focuses on candidates’ knowledge of the English language and grammars. 100% of English Education M.Ed. 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 Foundations Rdg Wtg (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 2 focuses on candidates’ knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes. 100% of English Education M.Ed. 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 Know Literatures (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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 3 focuses on candidates’ knowledge 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. 100% of English Education M.Ed. 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 Know Literary Theories (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Portfolio Standard 4 focuses on candidates’ knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy. 100% of English Education M.Ed. 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 Instructional Practice (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 5 focuses on candidates’ knowledge 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. 100% of English Education M.Ed. completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationales.

**M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6 Learning Environments (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 6 focuses on candidates’ demonstration that they create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability. 100% of English Education M.Ed. completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

**M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7 Prof Development (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 7 focuses on candidates’ demonstration that they view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. 100% of English Education M.Ed. completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard through portfolio artifacts and either their written or oral rationale.

**M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 Assessment (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Portfolio Standard 8 focuses on candidates’ knowledge and 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. 100% of English Education M.Ed. completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of this standard 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
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 school year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail

**Increase Publicity in M.Ed. English Education**

Effort will be made to increase public awareness of the English Ed program within and to recruit new applicants. Techniques will include improved website information, distribution of program information through email distribution lists and mass mailings. In 2007-2008, a new measure will be created to evaluate this action. The number of applicants and students accepted will be computed with a goal of increasing by 25% over 2006-2007 levels.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2007 - 2008
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?**
All English Education M.Ed. completers performed at high levels on all standards. Oral defenses of the portfolios underscored students’ strengths in English language and grammars, literature, literary theory, reading and writing processes, pedagogy and assessment. With respect to Action Item 1: Enhance focus on English grammars, faculty designed and developed a course in English Education, EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of Language. This course will explicitly address the content knowledge within this standard. Feedback from the instructor and students will inform faculty as to the value of this course for candidates in the English Education program.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The assessments indicate that English Education M.Ed. completers performed at high levels in their knowledge and understanding of all standards. Faculty have identified enrollment to be an area of continued attention.

---
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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. The TEEMS English Education M.Ed. degree program leads to teacher certification in secondary English (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain sufficient subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content, and manage classrooms effectively.

**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: 1)**
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

**O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 2)**
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: 3)**

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
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: 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.

**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: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 5)**

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: 6)**

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: 7)**

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: 8)**

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
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: 9)**

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 2: Student Learning (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Understands Student Development re: Learning" at the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Can Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners" at the expected level.

**M 3: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

96% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies" at the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Can Motivate and Manage Students for Learning" at the expected level.

**M 5: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Uses Communication Skills and Technology" at the expected level.

**M 6: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Can Effectively Plan for Instruction" at the expected level.

**M 7: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

98% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning” at the expected level.

**M 8: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Practices Professional Reflection" at the expected level.

**M 9: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community (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**

85% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

82.5% of our students in the TEEMS English Education M.Ed. program met "Involves School and Community in Learning” at the expected level.

**M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy (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**

85% 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.
### Analysis of Alternative Models of Field Experience

Over the next year, TEEEM English Faculty, practicum and student teaching supervisors, and cooperating teachers will collaboratively consider alternative models for field experience. Currently, the TEEEM 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>TEEEM English Education Faculty and Supervisors: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implement + Analyze Alternative Field Experiences

In 2007-2008, TEEEM English Education program faculty, practicum and student teaching supervisors, and cooperating teachers will collaborate on alternative models for field experiences. We will implement and analyze (a) a tutoring experience working one-on-one with struggling readers and writers, and (b) a year-long internship in Professional Development Schools and partner school sites. These changes are designed to increase interns’ abilities in all student outcomes and program objectives, particularly their ability to foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support secondary students’ learning and well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Implementation 2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Ewa McGrail, Michelle Zoss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase Collaboration and Communication

The recent 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 among faculty, supervisors, and cooperating/mentor teachers. To that end, in 2006-2007, we held three meetings with all faculty and supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program documents, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors visited practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating/mentor teachers in order to provide a program overview and discuss expectations. This initiative strengthened the overall success of our interns while they were in the field. We will implement alternative models of field experiences in 2007-2008 and will continue to foster collaboration and communication among faculty, supervisors, and cooperating/mentor teachers. The year-long field experience in a Professional Development School or partner school site will offer the opportunity for increased collaboration among faculty, supervisors, and cooperating/mentor teachers. This increased collaboration and communication will benefit our students’ abilities in each of the ten learning outcomes/objectives for our program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge |

---

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

93% of our students in the TEEEM English Education program met "Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge" at the expected level.
**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 M.Ed. program can be found in our students' knowledge of their content fields, their wide repertoire of instructional practices, their ability to use assessments to monitor student progress and effectively plan instruction, their skill in technology as a tool for teaching and learning, and their reflective practice. In relation to Action Items I and II, meetings were held on multiple occasions with faculty and college supervisors for the practicum experiences to develop a new sequencing for course delivery and a new year-long model for student teaching. These meetings also addressed Action Item II by increasing the collaboration and communication between all faculty and college supervisors working in the program. This communication and collaboration influenced the positive performance of this year's candidates.

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

Although nine of ten measures of our students' performance were met at our target performance levels, we did identify one area as more difficult for our students. This area concerns their ability to foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support secondary students' learning and well-being. With respect to Action Item II from last year's assessment, the new model for the course sequencing and the year long practicum experience will be implemented this year and these changes will call for continued collaboration and communication among not only faculty and college supervisors but with cooperating teachers as well.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 English MA**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:03 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 (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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Computer Skills (Literature) (M: 1)**
Students will have computer skills appropriate to the discipline for both writing and research.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 8: Evaluative Skills (Literature) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Writing Skills (Literature) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to write clearly and persuasively about literature.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 10: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) (M: 1)**
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.
Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 11: 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. They will also 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 12: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) (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. 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.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 13: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (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. 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 14: 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 15: 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 16: 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 17: 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
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.

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.
the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O6: Researching Skills (Literature)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O7: Computer Skills (Literature)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O8: Evaluative Skills (Literature)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O9: Writing Skills (Literature)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.
No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O10: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O11: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O12: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O13: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

**Target for O14: Knowledge of history of Rhetoric (R & C)**

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.
Target for O15: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

Target for O16: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

Target for O17: Effective Communications Skills (R & C)

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

Target for O18: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)

In the previous assessment report, it was stated that during 2006-2007, the department would require M.A. students to defend their theses in order to graduate. This decision was reversed after faculty chose to drop the thesis defense, while still requiring a thesis from every M.A. student, and to institute a pro-seminar for beginning masters students instead. This course, to be taken in the second semester of M.A. study, will put more rigor at the beginning of the MA program and will provide more guidance on how to write a successful prospectus for the thesis. The responsibility for teaching the pro-seminars will rotate among faculty, and the syllabi for the course will be vetted through the Graduate Director and the Assistant Chair.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

No assessment data for the M.A. program beyond course grades and exam results was generated this year because the faculty reconsidered the the plan to institute a thesis defense that was outlined in the 2005-2006 assessment report. Instead of the defense, starting in the fall of 2007, students who complete a thesis will be assessed by the faculty on their thesis committee on how successfully their written work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes.

Develop criteria for M.A. thesis

The Graduate Director will create 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) | Craftsman
  | Effective Communications Skills (R & C) | Evaluative Skills (Literature) | Knowledge of history of Rhetoric (R & C) | Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C) | Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric
  | Knowledge of Theory (Literature) | Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) | Researching Skills (Literature) | Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition) | Revising Skills (Creative Writing) | Skills of Inquiry (Literature) | Writing Skills (Literature)

**Implementation Description:** October 1, 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Calvin Thomas, Graduate Director
Initiate 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: Effective Communications Skills (R&C)
- Content Knowledge (Literature) | Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R&C) | Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (R&C) | Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R&C)

Implementation Description: August 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Tanya Caldwell, Associate Graduate Director

Develop pro-seminar class (Rhetoric/Composition)
During 2007-2008, faculty members in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration will develop a pro-seminar similar to the newly developed course in the Literature Concentration with the intention of offering this course in spring 2009.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communications Skills (R&C)
- Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R&C) | Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R&C) | Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (R&C)

Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration

Initiate pro-seminar classes (Literature)
Starting in the fall of 2007, all entering M.A. students in the Literature concentration will a pro-seminar class (English 8001) in the spring semester; they will be expected to have a draft-to-finished version of their M.A. thesis prospectus by the end of the course. They will also assemble their committee during this semester. (The M.A. program will be expanded by three credit hours to accommodate this new class without cutting into other courses.) This course is intended to cultivate good scholarly habits and methodologies, to identify students’ strengths and remediate weaknesses, to emphasize timelines and other organizational structures designed to help students move through their program, and to help them internalize the processes of research and writing. This course also aims to encourage students to finish their theses and graduate by the end of the second year of the M.A. studies.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- 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 Theory (Literature) | Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) | Researching Skills (Literature) | Skills of Inquiry (Literature) | Writing Skills (Literature)

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: the Graduate Director and the graduate faculty
Additional Resources: Two pro-seminar courses will run each spring semester, so faculty teaching time will be needed for this action. Additionally, faculty will be called upon for M.A. level direction and committee participation much more heavily than in the past.

Initiate the M.A. thesis assessment
All M.A. theses that are completed during 2006-2007 will be assessed for their level of proficiency, in terms of the graduate learning outcomes. Faculty members of a thesis committee will jointly complete a thesis assessment form that uses a six-point scale.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- 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 Theory (Literature) | Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) | Researching Skills (Literature) | Skills of Inquiry (Literature) | Writing Skills (Literature)

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director and faculty on theses committees

---

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

- Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
  - What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued

During the 2006-2007 year, the faculty did not gather assessment data on the M.A. program because it was reconsidering decisions for programmatic change for this program. All the same, the director of Graduate Students was able to get a general sense that M.A. students continue to be successful in their studies. Also there is a great deal of optimism about the programmatic change for next year; by deciding not to initiate the thesis defense but to institute the pro-seminar for entering students instead, the faculty have chosen to give greater emphasis to early stages of the program, with the hopes that the knowledge and skills gained from the pro-seminar will filter over into the writing of the thesis.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued
Because the assessment measures of the thesis were not instituted this year, it is critical to establish these measures in the
upcoming year so that we can begin to gather statistical data on the program.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2006-2007 English PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Content Knowledge (Literature) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (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 7: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to teach an entry-level course or an upper-level course in their discipline.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 8: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1)**
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).

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1)**
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.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 10: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C) (M: 1)**
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 review). 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).

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 11: Effective Communication 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 12: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition) (M: 1)**
Students can conduct graduate-level research on topics of interest to the interdisciplinary field of Rhetoric and Composition.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Ph.D. Dissertation

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 graduate 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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0.

Target for O2: Researching/Writing Skills (Literature)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0

Target for O6: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0

Target for O7: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0

Target for O8: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0
Finding 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that isGrammatically Sound = 5.0.

Target for O10: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Finding 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0.

Target for O11: Effective Communication Skills (R & C)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Finding 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0.

Target for O12: Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Finding 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were as follows: Familiarity with Representative Examples of Writing = 5.0; Understanding of Literary History = 5.0; Understanding of Form and Theory of Fiction or Poetry = 5.0; Ability to Draw upon Knowledge to Create Meaningful Literary Work = 6.0; Ability to Produce Work That is Authentic and Engaging = 6.0; and Ability to Produce Work that is Grammatically Sound = 5.0.

Target for O13: Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp)

While there were no numerical targets set for the 2006-2007 assessment year, goals were set to press students to turn in their dissertations with ample time for readers to read the work thoroughly and to encourage students to finish their coursework in the ideal six-year period since dissertations done in this period of time are generally more successful.

Finding 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Nine dissertations were defended this semester: seven in literature, one in creative writing, and one in rhetoric and composition. For the knowledge categories for the Literature and Rhetoric/Composition dissertations, the results were as follows (using a 6-point scale): Knowledge of Figures, Genres, and Movements = 5.3; Knowledge of Scholarly Vocabulary = 4.8; Knowledge of Language = 5.3; and Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts = 4.3. In the skills categories, the scores were as follows: Effectively Communicates Argument = 4.9; Adequate Graduate-level Research = 5.3; an Oral Defense that Demonstrates Mastery of the Concept = 5.1; Overall Evaluation = 5.1. For the Creative Writing dissertation, the scores were...
Norming faculty scoring on the dissertation form

M 2: Use teaching portfolios to assess teaching (O: 7)

It has been a long established policy for the Director of Lower Division Studies to assess teaching done by Graduate Teaching Assistants. Teaching Assistants in English are Instructors of record, so it is imperative that their success in the classroom be monitored and encouraged. Teaching Assistants are required to submit a teaching portfolio each spring that includes the teacher’s c.v., a teaching philosophy, a reflection on each course taught, class syllabi, a learning outcome analysis for each class taught, student evaluations, observation reports, and a PDC response. The Director of Lower Division Studies reviews this material and provides a formative evaluation and response for each teaching assistant. In addition, teaching assistants are required to attend all Teaching Conferences (2 or 3 per academic year), and Professional Development Communities, small groups of 4 to 10 people, often facilitated by a faculty member or a seasoned TA. These Conferences and Communities discuss teaching issues as well as subjects of interest to graduate students getting ready for applying for jobs in their fields. Finally, the Director of Lower Division Studies looks at student evaluations to determine student impressions of their teaching.

Target for O7: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations)

Every Teaching Assistant will complete a teaching portfolio, attend all teaching conferences, be an active member of a Professional Development Community, and maintain an average student evaluation of 4.5 on Question 17. Formative evaluation of the portfolios, conferences, and communities are provided to teach Teaching Assistant.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Of the 85 Teaching Assistants in 2006-2007--74 of whom are in the PhD program--, 78 submitted a teaching portfolio (92%). Of those who submitted a teaching portfolio, 72 included all of the parts of the portfolio required (92%), 80% of TAs demonstrated ways to write an effective teaching philosophy, and everyone included syllabi and course reflections a CV, student evaluations, observation reports by faculty and peers, and a response to the Professional Development Community they were part of (or not, and why). Because formative assessment/response aims to improve learning in progress rather than a finished product, it is the best way to encourage good teaching (as opposed to some number ranking), the Director of Lower Division and her Associate Director write extensive responses to the teaching portfolio, focusing on aspects that TAs will likely use in their future academic situations - like the teaching philosophy. Responses include suggestions as well as basic overall responses. Teaching Conferences are 2-day conferences with concurrent sessions about teaching and professional development. TAs lead most of the sessions, sharing ideas and questions in round table fashion. However, each semester English faculty are invited to participate, and do. TAs report that they enjoy these conferences for their information, but also for the community they develop among TAs and faculty at the beginning of each semester. The teaching portfolio requests a reflection concerning the Professional Development Communities as well. Through these reflections, the Director learns about TA attitudes and involvement in this part of the training program. Several TAs indicated that the way their Professional Community was designed was not effective or informative for them (24%). Another 52% responded that their community was extremely helpful and that they would continue to meet together in the following year. The rest reported that they thought the communities were "ok". Communities that have consistent faculty mentoring/facilitation are the communities that respond most favorably. Finally, the Student Evaluations indicate that the average score on Question 17 over the whole year was 4.42 with a range from 2 to 5. Two hundred- seventy-two classes and 85 TAs are included in this average.

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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Ph.D. Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp)
  | Researching/Writing Skills (Literature) | Revising Skills (Creative Writing)
Implementation Description: May, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Studies Committee

Continue to assess teaching ability

While the training for Teaching Assistants improves each year, next year we hope to increase the percentages for turning in teaching portfolios, involve more faculty in the teaching conferences and in the Professional Development Communities, since this element seems to draw very positive response from TAs. We will also work to provide a more conscious effort toward mentoring TAs, both those who are already good teachers and those who do not exhibit positive responses from students. In addition, we will work to attend more specifically to the student evaluations in that we will review what students are evaluating when they respond to Item 17 on the evaluation form. We will also list comments from students as we assess this aspect of teaching. Finally, the evaluation of graduate teaching assistants is an extremely important part of overseeing the teaching of the introductory English courses. This process will continue in 2007-2008, but this year with a fuller sense of how this evaluation work ties in to students’ achievement of the graduate learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Use teaching portfolios to assess teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching Skills (in all three concentrations)
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Lower Division Studies

Norming faculty scoring on the dissertation form
One area of concern is that as many as three out of the eight literature and rhetoric/composition dissertations scored as "outstanding" in the overall evaluation category. This ranking was meant to be reserved for dissertations that are ready for publication with very little revision work. Faculty members need to be reminded that this top score is meant to indicate truly exceptional work.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Ph.D. Dissertation | Content Knowledge (Literature)
- Effective Communication Skills (R & C) | Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C)
- Effective Writing Skills (Rhetoric and Comp) | Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C)
- Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C) | Researching Skills (Rhetoric and Composition)
- Researching/Writing Skills (Literature)

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**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?**

In 2006-2007, more dissertations were defended than in previous years. This suggests that with the various programmatic changes that have been put into place in recent years, students are beginning to advance through the program at a faster rate. The data from the dissertation assessment do not indicate any areas of particular weakness, though it is true that skills areas are ranked slightly higher than the knowledge scores. Another concern last year was that students did not give readers enough time to read their dissertations before the defense date. While no programmatic change was instituted to correct this, this did not prove to be a problem this year, even with the large number of dissertations submitted. This suggests that dissertation directors have worked with individual students to avoid timing issues. The lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical approaches. This might suggest that greater emphasis needs to be given to this outcome on the part of dissertation committees. Teaching Effectiveness: Since this is the first year we have reported on teaching effectiveness among the Teaching Assistants, we will compare data next year with this year's. However, we should note that this process for reflecting on and evaluating teaching effectiveness among TAs has been ongoing for 3 years. Before that, a different process for evaluating teaching effectiveness was in place for nearly 5 years. Attending to teaching effectiveness is a long-standing activity in English since our TAs work with nearly every freshman student at GSU.

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

The lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical approaches. This might suggest that greater emphasis needs to be given to this outcome on the part of dissertation committees. Teaching Effectiveness: We will hold sessions on writing teaching philosophies during teaching conferences and in the Professional Development Communities. And we will work to increase student evaluation numbers as well as attend to comments students make, which may be more revealing than the numbers themselves.
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**

1. Written Communication--major
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
11. Quantitative Skills--major
12. Quantitative Skills--core
13. Technology--major

**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
3. Oral Communication--major
7. Critical Thinking--major
11. Quantitative Skills--major

**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 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

**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**

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**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

**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

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

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

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
11 Quantitative Skills--major
14 Technology--core

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

We had 91% of our students that received passing scored in major courses.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Whereas this measure is currently optionally, the curriculum has been changed so that it will become required effective with students entering the program fall 2007.

Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor

90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Whereas this measure is currently optionally, the curriculum has been changed so that it will become required effective with students entering the program fall 2007.

Target for O5: Has effective practical skills

90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Whereas this measure is currently optionally, the curriculum has been changed so that it will become required effective with students entering the program fall 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

This measure has been met with selected populations such as obese, sedentary, elderly. We are considering ways to provide exposure to additionally populations. One way of doing this is that we have included a disability sports course in the curriculum and their pass rate will be measured to further assess this outcome.

**Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor**

That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

This measure has been met with selected populations such as obese, sedentary, elderly. We are considering ways to provide exposure to additionally populations. One way of doing this is that we have included a disability sports course in the curriculum and their pass rate will be measured to further assess this outcome.

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

This measure has been met with selected populations such as obese, sedentary, elderly. We are considering ways to provide exposure to additionally populations. One way of doing this is that we have included a disability sports course in the curriculum and their pass rate will be measured to further assess this outcome.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students passed the first aid course

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students passed the first aid course

**Target for O5: Has effective practical skills**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students passed the first aid course

**Target for O6: Ensures safety in physical activity settings**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students passed the first aid course

**Target for O7: Demonstrates competence with technology**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97% of our students passed the first aid course

**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

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science**
That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In courses that incoude that information, over 85% of the students that took the courses past the courses.

**Target for O2: Can assess clients` fitness**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In courses that incoude that information, over 85% of the students that took the courses past the courses.

**Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In courses that incoude that information, over 85% of the students that took the courses past the courses.

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In courses that incoude that information, over 85% of the students that took the courses past the courses.

**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.

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

Students will demonstrate a practical knowledge of Exercise Science labs as 90% of students will successfully pass the lab exam and lab reports.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

We had 95% of our students that met the expectations labs and received passing scores. We are considering restructuring some lab experiences to enhance students lab opportunities and involvement.

**Target for O5: Has effective practical skills**

Students will demonstrate a practical knowledge of Exercise Science labs as 90% of students will successfully pass the lab exam and lab reports.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

We had 95% of our students that met the expectations labs and received passing scores. We are considering restructuring some lab experiences to enhance students lab opportunities and involvement.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

We had 95% of our students that met the expectations labs and received passing scores. We are considering restructuring some lab experiences to enhance students lab opportunities and involvement.

**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 work place setting.

**Target for O2: Can assess clients` fitness**

100% of the students will successfully pass internships.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All of our students that registered for internships successfully completed the courses.

---

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

**Class projects**

Students will be asked to complete practical class projects that enhances 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

### Adapt curriculum to require Health Fitness Exam
Whereas this measure is currently optionally, the curriculum has been changed so that it will become required the Health Fitness Examination effective with students entering the program fall 2007.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Coordinator of program

### Provide experience assisting special needs persons
This measure has been met with selected populations such as obese, sedentary, elderly. We are considering ways to provide exposure to additionally special needs populations. In an effort to meet this need a disability sports course has been added as an elective in the curriculum and future pass rates will be measured to further assess this action.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Medium

**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science Faculty

### Restructuring Labs
We are discussing as a faculty restructuring some lab experiences to enhance students lab opportunities and involvement. We expect to make a decision on that fall, 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments were generally made by taking the number of students that had taken courses and dividing by the number that had taken the courses or have met the objective in another manner (such as lab or internship experiences) to determine the successful percentage. Our results indicate that students are receiving an excellent base of knowledge and they are being provided with the skills to use this knowledge in a practical manner. They have good technological skills (computers) and they are knowledgeable of safety and preventive planning in exercise and fitness settings. They developed good interpersonal skills for working with clients and they enjoyed their learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a good knowledge of working with special populations, but we desire for even greater ability to work with some of these populations. To ensure that our students are getting the knowledge base that is equivalent or exceeds that across the country, starting in the fall of 2007, all entering majors will be required to take the Health Fitness Instructor’s test. We further believe that one can never learn too much about safety, so safety in the workplace will continue to be emphasized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Exercise Science MS**
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(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 administer graded exercise tests to various populations

**Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing**
90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
94% of students demonstrated proficiency in the GXT practical examination, exceeding the target performance level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 100% passing rates in all classes with some exceptions. In KH 7500, 80% of students met or exceeded the target performance level. In PH 7550, 84% met the level. In KH 8390, 89% of students met the level. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% of students demonstrated proficiency, exceeding the 90% target level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the target level of performance for case studies and laboratory assignments.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- Measure: Case Studies and Labs | Outcome/Objective: Understands research and human subjects issues
- Measure: GXT practical exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- Measure: Practical Exams | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge to practical situations

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science program faculty

Monitor and Maintain
Monitor and maintain current strengths.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- Measure: Case Studies and Labs | Outcome/Objective: Understands research and human subjects issues
- Measure: GXT practical exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- Measure: Practical Exams | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge to practical situations

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Mark Geil

Syllabi connection
In some courses, course objectives on syllabi are connected with specific knowledge, skills, and abilities for ACSM certification. The connection should be made for all appropriate courses.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
- Measure: Case Studies and Labs | Outcome/Objective: Understands research and human subjects issues
- Measure: GXT practical exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing
- Measure: Practical Exams | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge to practical situations

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Mark Geil

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall strengths were maintained in 2006-2007. 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?
Once again, all target levels were met, so continued attention will monitor programs in order to continue to maintain high achievement.
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, 2)
Students will learn the basics of cinema that will lay the groundwork 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, 2)
Students will gain an understanding of the history of cinema.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: interpret cinema (M: 1, 2)
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 average number of correct answers on the 17 questions from the sample of 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 2700 was 9.08. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 1010 was 10.45. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 4750 was 11.11.
**Target for O2: cinema history**

The average number of correct answers on the 17 questions from the sample of 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 2700 was 9.08. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 1010 was 10.45. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 4750 was 11.11.

**Target for O3: interpret cinema**

The average number of correct answers on the 17 questions from the sample of 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 2700 was 9.08. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 1010 was 10.45. The average number correct on the 17-item exam from a sample in Film 4750 was 11.11.

**M 2: research paper (O: 1, 2, 3)**

A sample of research papers from Film 4810, American Film History I, and Film 4960, American Film History II, courses will be graded on a 1 - 4 scale using a 5-point rubric.

**Target for O1: cinema basics**

The average of the scores should be 2.5 or higher based on the 1 - 4 scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4810 was 2.8. The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4960 was 3.0.

**Target for O2: cinema history**

The average of the scores should be 2.5 or higher based on the 1 - 4 scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4810 was 2.8. The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4960 was 3.0.

**Target for O3: interpret cinema**

The average of the scores should be 2.5 or higher based on the 1 - 4 scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4810 was 2.8. The average of the scores from a sample of research papers in Film 4960 was 3.0.

**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

**additional objectives**

The Film/video faculty should consider adding more objectives which may aid the assessment of the major.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
  - cinema history | interpret cinema
  - Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
  - cinema history | interpret cinema

- Implementation Description: fall 07
- Responsible Person/Group: Film/video faculty

**curricular revision**

The Film/video faculty will meet to revise the curriculum to improve the numbering of courses in order that students can track their
progress through the major.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics

Implementation Description: fall 07
Responsible Person/Group: film/video faculty

increase assessment measures
Additional measures will be added to improve the tracking of students progress through a number of different components related to the major’s objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics
- Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: cinema basics

Implementation Description: fall 07
Responsible Person/Group: film/video faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessment of the Film/video curriculum indicates remarkable stability even with changes in the measures. Using the average number of correct answers in the sample of exams in Film 1010, Film 2700 and Film 4750 (rather than a 1 - 4 scale used the previous years) did not affect the results that the students in the upper-division course scored higher than the students in the lower-division courses. Adding a second measure to determine if the students' writing indicated learning about the film verified that students in upper-division courses had a sophisticated knowledge of the major's objectives. This assessment of writing will be mandatory for the Critical Thinking Through Writing courses identified by the faculty as essential to completing the major. It already has changed the Film 1010 course to include a significant writing component in order that film majors are better prepared for writing assignments in the upper-division courses.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Film/video curriculum will be evaluated to improve how students can progress through the major. Simply by changing the numbers assigned to courses can help undergrads understand what courses they need to take before others. The faculty may consider adding more objectives to help with this evaluation and to facilitate assessment of the revised curriculum. Increasing the number of measures of the objectives would help the faculty assess specific components of the major. Currently the 17-item exam has questions categorized and these categories could be the basis of additional measures for the curriculum.
### SLO 2: The development of technical skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

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

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

See Finance results for measure 1 for findings for Measure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

Target for O2: The development of technical skills

Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 3 for findings for Measure 3.

M 4: Enhance student practical training (O: 2, 3)

To enable students to engage in the practicum of finance, we partner with Atlanta area corporations to offer field study experiences to students. These field studies allow student to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects.

Target for O2: The development of technical skills

Our target for the next academic year is to continue to expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

During the past academic year, approximately 35 students have completed field studies at a number of prominent Atlanta area organizations.

Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

Our target for the next academic year is to continue to expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.
## Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

During the past academic year, approximately 35 students have completed field studies at a number of prominent Atlanta area organizations.

## 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
  - Measure: Representative questions from courses
  - Outcome/Objective: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

  **Implementation Description:** continuous

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Milind Shrikhande

### Additional resources

Writing consultants

---

### 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:** 2006-2007
- **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:** 2006-2007
- **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:** Professors Peter Eisemann and Richard Fendler

  **Additional Resources:** Writing consultants
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. To follow up on progress made during the year in regards to the 2005-2006 action plan, the following activities are noted. (1) Careers and professionalism. Several initiatives took place under the leadership of Professor Craig Ruff. These were introduced into the FI 4000 course, which is required of all finance majors as the first course in their major. The initiatives included a) on-line video interviews of finance professionals. Given the wide breadth of finance-oriented careers, seven practitioners were interviewed from a variety of fields, such as investments, banking, consulting, and corporate finance; b) adoption of a required finance-career-exploration text "Careers in Finance" by Trudy Ring, which provides an overview of many different finance career options for college undergraduates; c) a careers project. The goals of the careers project are to help students develop a better understanding of a particular field within the broad finance profession and to practice creating a job-search plan and related job-search materials. The project consists of the following elements: a description of field, job-hunting plan, informational interview, a resume, and a Myers-Briggs personality test; and d) career services class speakers. Speakers from both the RCB’s Career Management Center and the University Career Services were brought in to discuss the job-search process and to describe the resources available to students from the university. (2) Practical training. Progress was made in identifying additional corporate partners for the offering of field study opportunities for undergraduate finance majors. (3) Communication skills. The ‘Writing Across the Curriculum’ initiative is increasingly becoming integrated as an important component of FI 4020, which is required of all finance majors.

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 addition, efforts will be expended to integrate the University’s critical thinking through writing initiative into the finance major.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Finance MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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, 4)
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. Quality professional programs
2. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

### 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 choose 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

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 3 for findings for Measure 3.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 3 for findings for Measure 3.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 3 for findings for Measure 3.

**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 80th percentile.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 1 for findings for Measure 1.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**
Median scores shall be at or above 80th percentile.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 1 for findings for Measure 1.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**
Median scores shall be at or above 80th percentile.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 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 or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**
At or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**
At or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
See Finance results for measure 2 for findings for Measure 2.

**M 4: Enhance student practical training (O: 2, 3)**
To enable students to engage in the practicum of finance, we partner with Atlanta area corporations to offer field study experiences to students. These field studies allow student to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**
Our target for the next academic year is to continue to expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year, 18 students completed field studies at organizations such as Smith Barney, CCG Investments, JP Morgan Chase, and Westminster Securities.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**
Our target for the next academic year is to continue to expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the past academic year, 18 students completed field studies at organizations such as Smith Barney, CCG Investments, JP Morgan Chase, and Westminster Securities.

**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

Curriculum
The quality of students entering the MS-Finance Program has maintained its improvement over the 2003-04 baseline year with average GMAT scores during 2005-06 at approximately 635, based on a sample-study of students admitted to the program. To maintain and improve upon these gains in student quality, 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 can overlap with a student’s prior coursework. These courses could be replaced with higher level courses tailored to each student’s career goals and prior preparation.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: MS-Finance exit survey responses | Outcome/Objective: The development of technical skills

Implementation Description: 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Professor Milind Shrikhande

Practical training
Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 is proving highly useful for providing MS-Finance students with real-world experience in independent project management (in financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). We will continue to identify additional corporate partners for purposes of expanding opportunities for students to participate. Our goal is to eventually have the field study course become an integral part and distinguishing aspect of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: MS-Finance exit survey responses | Outcome/Objective: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

Implementation Description: 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Professor Milind Shrikhande

Program marketing
Students pursuing an MBA degree, whether in finance or another related concentration, would benefit from the skill sets that an MS-Finance program develops. We plan to develop an efficient path for MBAs to also pursue a MS-Finance degree.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: 2008
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 Department’s assessment indicates that the specialization streams of corporation finance, investments, and financial institution continue to maintain both currency and relevancy to the educational and career needs of MS-Finance students. Faculty are all delivering high level instruction. The Department has successfully recruited 3 new professors to add to its existing world class caliber faculty to help ensure this momentum. Also, the quality of incoming students continues to be strong 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. To follow up on progress made during the year in regards to the 2005-2006 action plan, the following activities are noted. 1) Curriculum: To enable students to achieve higher levels of learning, custom programs of study were provided students who had demonstrated prior exposure to materials in the management science areas. In addition, accomodations are made to students seeking multiple specializations. 2) Practical training. Success was observed in
identifying new corporate partners for establishing additional field study courses.

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 continue to pursue opportunities for refinement of curriculum to enhance student learning. In addition, we continue to pursue additional corporate field study partners to provide students with practical training for improving their career prospects.

---

**Georgia State University**
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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 French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of francophone 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: Ability to teach French language and culture (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 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
- 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
- 1.2 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
- 3.2 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**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.1 Recruitment
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Understanding spoken French (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 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**

- 4.3 Technology
**SLO 3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context (M: 3, 5, 7, 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
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major
- 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 French (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9)**

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

**SLO 5: Reading French (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 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: 3, 4, 5, 8, 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: 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 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
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Understanding Spoken French (O: 2, 4, 8)
All French majors scored 5.00.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

#### M 2: Speaking French (O: 1, 2, 4)
All French majors scored 5.10.

**Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### M 3: Reading French (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
All French majors scored 4.81.

**Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O5: Reading French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O6: Writing in French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

### M 4: Writing in French (O: 1, 4, 5, 6)
All French majors scored 5.00.

**Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Speaking French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Reading French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Writing in French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Knowledge of Francophone Literature (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

All French majors scored 4.24.

**Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Speaking French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Reading French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Writing in French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Knowledge of Francophone Literature (O: 1, 5, 8)**

French Majors whose concentration was Literature scored 5.18.

Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O5: Reading French

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Knowledge of Francophone cultures (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**

All French majors scored 4.24.

Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O2: Understanding spoken French

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O5: Reading French

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

M 8: Knowledge of French Business and Concepts (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
French majors whose concentration was Language and International Business scored 5.83.

Target for O2: Understanding spoken French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for O4: Speaking French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for O5: Reading French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for O6: Writing in French
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O5: Reading French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O6: Writing in French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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.

---

**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

**Curricular change, homework, online activities**

The section will change the curriculum in the lower-level courses to better prepare incoming majors. Currently the introductory text is covered in two semesters. It will be changed to three, allowing much more practice and more time for the study of cultural topics. Daily preparation will be required, as always, in upper-division courses; it will be better monitored, in different ways according to the class (e.g., in the 3023, through lab recordings or a written text for almost every class day). In all appropriate classes (culture, applied language, some literature), some online activities will be required.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Knowledge of Francophone cultures
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of francophone cultures
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Assessments show that French majors surpassed the goal of 4.0 in every area except one. They can speak, read and write French at the level described, and their knowledge of francophone culture and business practices, and their ability to analyze literary texts, is appropriate for BA candidates. Achievement levels correspond roughly to those of 05-06, with two exceptions: knowledge of business practices, which improved significantly (it was 3.6 last year); and knowledge of teaching practices, which fell from 4.3 to 3.73.

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

The score of 4.24 in francophone culture, while meeting the goal and surpassing it slightly, suggests that some majors may be inadequately versed in this area. The overall score of 3.73 on pedagogical practices attained by the French majors preparing to teach does not meet the goal. The French section will attempt to determine if this is an endemic problem, or if the disappointing score was the result of inadequate performance by a small number of students whose lack of success depressed the overall score.

---

**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)

**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)

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students who took the comprehensive exams and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper, therefore graduating. Fall 2006 1 student Spring 2007 3 students

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students who took the comprehensive exams and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper, therefore graduating. Fall 2006 1 student Spring 2007 3 students

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students who took the comprehensive exams and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper, therefore graduating. Fall 2006 1 student Spring 2007 3 students
**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students who took the comprehensive exams and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper, therefore graduating. Fall 2006 1 student Spring 2007 3 students

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

**Adding courses**

The French section has added one new course for the new concentration in French Studies, and more are under consideration.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Thesis, pedagogical project or research paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of knowledge | Effective writing, communication and editing | Research and data collecting skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** French faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The French section has added a new concentration, "French Studies", which emphasizes culture and civilization. It has also provided a study-abroad program in Tours (France) geared towards graduate students.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Geography BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST)

**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: Communication -- Oral (M: 2)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major

**SLO 2: Communication -- Visual (M: 2, 3)**

Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.


Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

11 Quantitative Skills--major
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively and appropriately apply quantitative methods to geographical problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

11 Quantitative Skills--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively collect appropriate evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Technology (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to geography.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

13 Technology--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Collaboration (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Contemporary Issues -- &quot;Global&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Communication -- Written (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Work in GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) (O: 7, 12, 13, 14)**
Student papers written in the capstone course for geography majors. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O7: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were 4.2, 4.3, 4.3, and 3.6. Outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 100%, 100%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were 4.2, 4.3, 4.3, and 3.6. Outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 100%, 100%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were 4.2, 4.3, 4.3, and 3.6. Outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 100%, 100%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were 4.2, 4.3, 4.3, and 3.6. Outcomes 1, 2, 9, and 10, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 100%, 100%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**M 2: Work in GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography) (O: 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14)**

Student work including assignments and examination responses. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O1: Communication – Oral**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O2: Communication – Visual**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.
**Target for O7: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O8: Technology**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.3, 4.0, 3.7, 4.3, 4.1, 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, and 4.7. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, 90%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**M 3: Work in GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis) (O: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14)**
This measure is based on the following: (1) student responses on final exam, (2) student statements in final assignment, and (3) student proficiency with software used for the in-class exercises. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O2: Communication – Visual**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 90%, 70%, 60%, 90%, 90%, 90%, 70%, and 90%. It needs to be noted that there were only ten Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcome 3 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O3: Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O7: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O8: Technology**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.
above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both:
(1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0. Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were met by the following percentages of students: 88%, 75%, 88%, 75%, 25%, 63%, and 88%. It needs to be noted that there were only eight Geography majors in the course. As can be discerned from above, outcomes 6 and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both:
(1) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (2) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**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
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 1 January 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Department of Geosciences

**Involve more geography courses**
Acquire learning-outcome scores from all 4000-level geography courses, and have scores for each outcome derived from work done by students in at least two courses.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 1 January 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Department of Geosciences

**Assess all learning outcomes**
Each of the 14 learning outcomes will be assessed in at least three courses. Beginning in 2007/2008, there will be seven required courses from which to collect data for learning-outcomes assessment. Those courses are as follows: GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography), GEOG 452 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis), GEOG 4644 (Environmental Conservation), GEOG 4764 (Urban Geography), GEOG 4778 (Political Geography), GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change), and GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar). Furthermore, as a reminder to the instructor and the students, the learning outcomes that apply to a course will be listed on its syllabus.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 1 January 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Department of Geosciences

**Focus on outcomes that were not met**
Substantial attention will be focused on the three learning outcomes that were not met. Those outcomes are as follows: (1) students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats; (2) students apply quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively; and (3) students evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately. In courses where those outcomes will be assessed, substantial effort will be made to ensure that all students meet those outcomes. In essence, students need better instruction in oral communication, the use of quantitative methods, and critical thinking.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 20 August 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Jeremy E. Diem

**Provide instructors with rubrics**
Each instructor of the seven required courses will receive an electronic copy of a rubric containing the learning outcomes to be assessed in the course and a list of the undergraduate Geography majors in the course. The instructor will be asked to constantly modify the scores in the rubric based on student performance in the course throughout the semester. In reference to the first action plan, it needs to restated that the learning outcomes to be assessed in the course will be listed on the course syllabus.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 20 August 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Jeremy E. Diem

**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 a definite improvement over the assessment from last year. Two action plans from last year...
resulted in the following: (1) the inclusion of additional courses in the assessment; and (2) the adoption of a five-point rating system. Finally, the number of learning outcomes was reduced from 24 to 14, thereby making the assessment more parsimonious.

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

As noted in an action plan resulting from this assessment, substantial attention will be focused on the three learning outcomes that were not met. Those outcomes are as follows: (1) students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats; (2) students apply quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively; and (3) students evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately. In courses where those learning outcomes will be assessed, instruction will be modified to ensure that most students meet those outcomes. Students need better instruction in communication, quantitative methods, and critical thinking.

---
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### 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: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts.

**SLO 2: Communication -- Written (M: 1)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 3: Communication -- Oral (M: 1)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**SLO 4: Communication -- Visual (M: 1)**

Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.

**SLO 5: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations (M: 1)**

Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.

**SLO 6: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving (M: 1)**

Students apply quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively.

**SLO 8: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) (M: 1)**

Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.

**SLO 9: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection (M: 1)**

Students collect appropriate evidence.

**SLO 10: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation (M: 1)**

Students evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**SLO 11: Technology (M: 1)**

Students use computers and other technology appropriate to geography effectively.

**SLO 12: Collaboration (M: 1)**

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

**SLO 13: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines (M: 1)**

Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**SLO 14: Contemporary Issues -- "Global" (M: 1)**
Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive exam, thesis/practicum, and seminars (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data used to assess learning-outcomes achievement of graduated M.A. students were obtained from critiques of those students’ comprehensive examinations (i.e. written exam and oral exam), theses/practicums, and performance in graduate-only seminars. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Communication -- Written**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication -- Oral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Communication -- Visual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for **O6**: Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O7**: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O8**: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O9**: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O10**: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O11**: Technology

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

### Target for **O12**: Collaboration

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.
4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

**Target for O13: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

**Target for O14: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Only five M.A. students graduated between Spring 2006 and Spring 2007; thus, the findings below are not especially robust. The mean scores for the 14 outcomes (in numerical order) are as follows: 4.3, 3.3, 3.8, 4.3, 4.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.0, 4.3, 4.2, 4.6, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.7. Therefore, outcomes except for outcome 2 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats) and outcome 3 (i.e. students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats) were met. The most likely reason for those two outcomes not being met was that two of the graduated students were not native English speakers.

**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

**Provide seminar instructors with rubrics**
Graduate-level seminars will be treated as secondary sources of learning-outcomes data. Therefore, all seminar instructors will be provided with rubrics for outcomes assessment. In particular, instructors will be urged to assess outcome 12 (i.e. students participate effectively in collaborative activities), since that outcome cannot be assessed using information from the comprehensive exam.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy E. Diem

**Put learning outcomes in the comprehensive exams**
Questions in both the written and oral portions of the M.A. comprehensive exam will be linked with as many learning outcomes as possible. Committee members will be asked to identify all learning outcomes that could be assessed from student responses to a particular question.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 20 August 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy E. Diem

**Rigorously analyze theses and practicums**
All theses and practicums -- and associated defenses -- will be analyzed rigorously in order to determine whether certain learning outcomes have been met. The same rubrics to be used for the first two action plans will be used for this action plan.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** August 18, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy Crampton

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The number of learning outcomes for the M.A. program increased dramatically from the previous year. The lone action plan resulting from the 2005-2006 assessment called for a substantial increase in the number of learning outcomes, and the number of outcomes did increase from two to 14.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

All 14 learning outcomes need to be assessed more rigorously using a variety of measures in the future. The learning outcomes need to become intertwined deeply with the de-facto evaluation of comprehensive examinations, theses/practicums and associated oral defenses, and work in seminars.
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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, 8)

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: 9)

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: 1, 3, 10, 11, 12)

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
- 11 Quantitative Skills--major
- 13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

SLO 4: Critical thinking in Science and Geology (M: 13)

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
Laboratory mid term and final tests from GEOL1121 and GEOL1122 were analyzed to see how well students who are likely to enter graduate school will be able to construct a contour map from numerical data. The overall objective of the Geosciences Department (Geology BS program) is to develop and implement a means of assessing our students’ ability to think critically within our undergraduate core courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**SLO 5: Physical Constitution of the Earth (M: 1, 4)**

General Learning outcome 5: Each graduate shall have a general understanding of the physical constitution of the earth. Specific Outcomes: 5a. Each graduate will be able to characterize and identify common rocks and minerals in hand specimen and in thin section using the petrographic microscope. 5b. 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. 5c. Each graduate will be able to characterize the fundamental attributes of atoms and atomic bonding as they relate to crystal structures. 5d. Each graduate will be able to relate physical properties of the rock forming minerals to the crystal structure and chemistry of the minerals. 5e. 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. 5f. 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.

**SLO 6: Earth’s Internal and external processes (M: 1, 5)**

General Learning outcome 6: Each graduate shall develop a general understanding of both the internal and external dynamic processes of the earth system. 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.

**SLO 7: Earth and Solar System History (M: 1, 6)**

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.

**SLO 8: Critical Thinking--Core (M: 7)**

The objective of the Geosciences Department (Geology BS program) is to develop and implement a means of assessing our students’ ability to thinking critically within our undergraduate core courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122).

**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

**SLO 9: Skills common to geologic professionals (M: 1, 3)**

General Learning outcome 5: Each graduate shall develop skills common to geologic professionals. Specific Outcomes: 5a. Each graduate will be able to read and comprehend a geological map and construct a geological cross section from a map. 5b. Each graduate will be able to construct an internally consistent geological map from a set of given observations. 5c. Each graduate will be able to construct a contour map from numerical data.

**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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Geology 1121 and 1122 laboratory test questions (O: 3, 5, 6, 7, 9)**

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 O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field**

Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 3 94% 2 5 87% 58 6 93% 90 7 89% 180 8 87% 34

**Target for O5: Physical Constitution of the Earth**

Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 3 94% 2 5 87% 58 6 93% 90 7 89% 180 8 87% 34

**Target for O6: Earth’s Internal and external processes**

Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 3 94% 2 5 87% 58 6 93% 90 7 89% 180 8 87% 34

**Target for O7: Earth and Solar System History**

Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 3 94% 2 5 87% 58 6 93% 90 7 89% 180 8 87% 34

**Target for O9: Skills common to geologic professionals**

Students should score greater than 90% on introductory level questions relating to a given learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Learning Outcome Average Score on Questions Number of Questions 3 94% 2 5 87% 58 6 93% 90 7 89% 180 8 87% 34

**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 - The submitted papers may lack some polish but the submitted papers are basically sound.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL3002, 4006, 4007, 4013, 4015, 4016, 4095, and 4120. The average score is 3.3 with a standard deviation of 0.71 compared to 3.2 (0.75) last year.

**M 3: Professional Skills (O: 3, 9)**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL4007, 4013, and 4120. The average score is 4.3 with a standard deviation of 0.58 compared to 4.0 (0.0) last year.

**Target for O9: Skills common to geologic professionals**

4 - with some assistance student can construct maps and cross sections given numerical data or appropriate observations

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL4007, 4013, and 4120. The average score is
4.3 with a standard deviation of 0.58 compared to 4.0 (0.0) last year.

**M 4: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution (O: 5)**

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 O5: Physical Constitution of the Earth**

4 - >80%

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL3002, 4006, 4013, 4015, 4016, 4095, and 4120. The average score is 3.0 with a standard deviation of 0.0 compared to 3.4 (0.55) last year.

**M 5: Knowledge of Earth Processes (O: 6)**

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 O6: Earth’s Internal and external processes**

4 - >80%

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL3002, 4006, 4007, 4013, 4016, and 4120. The average score is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.54 compared to 3.7 (0.52) last year.

**M 6: Knowledge of Earth History (O: 7)**

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 O7: Earth and Solar System History**

4 - >80%

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL3002, 4006, 4013, and 4120. The average score is 3.3 with a standard deviation of 0.50. Last year there were no instructors that felt that their course had evaluated this learning outcome.

**M 7: Critical thinking core (O: 8)**

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 O8: Critical Thinking--Core**

Our target performance is 70-80%level of success on our multiple choice questions and other selected exercises.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past semester one GEOL 1121 course taught by Dr. Rose was evaluated as part of the Critical Thinking Initiative. Multiple choice questions requiring critical thinking skills were embedded into the four required course exams. These questions were largely the same as those which were given as part of the Geology Department’s semesterly reports in 2005 and 2006. Students achieved generally between 40-90% on these questions, similar in performance to past semesters. The review of the Geoscience’s Department past annual report was critical in terms of the low rate of faculty participation within the Critical Thinking Initiative. Unfortunately, this did not improve during the Spring, 2006 semester. We have talked about ways to improve the department’s participation within the CTI; however, the results have not yet been forthcoming.

**M 8: Oral Communication Rubric (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 . 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 - students can articulate their ideas and can construct a well organized, oral presentation perhaps with a few rough edges.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Instructors for the following courses rated their students using this rubric: GEOL3002, 4007, 4013, and 4120. The average score is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 0.44 compared to 3.6 (0.55) last year.

**M 9: Collaborative Skills Rubric (O: 2)**
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubrics:

**O4: Critical thinking in Science and Geology**

- **Target for O4:** Critical thinking in Science and Geology
- **Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
3 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
4 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric:

**M 10: Quantitative Skills Rubric (O: 3)**

- **Target for M 10:** Quantitative Skills Rubric
- **Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations
4 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations
5 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric:

**M 11: Technology Skills Rubric (O: 3)**

- **Target for M 11:** Technology Skills Rubric
- **Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations
4 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations
5 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric:

**M 12: Field Skills Rubric (O: 3)**

- **Target for M 12:** Field Skills Rubric
- **Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
3 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
4 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric:

**M 13: Critical Thinking Rubric (O: 4)**

- **Target for M 13:** Critical Thinking Rubric
- **Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
3 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
4 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met

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 operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
3 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information
4 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target:** Partially Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve collaborative skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for guiding students through group work will be shared with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Established in Cycle:</em> 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Implementation Status:</em> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Priority:</em> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Implementation Description:</em> Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Responsible Person/Group:</em> Department Chair (Tim La Tour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 |
| *Implementation Description:* Spring 2007 |
| *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 |
| *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 |
| *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 |
| *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. |

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)

Consider requiring paleontology
The faculty will continue to discuss the ramifications of adding paleontology to the geology major as a required course.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Knowledge of Earth History | Outcome/Objective: Earth and Solar System History
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

Continued emphasis on written work
All majors will continue to take at least two courses that have Writing Across the Curriculum components.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Written Work Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Oral and Written Communication Skills
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (W. Crawford Elliott)

Improve collaborative skills
Faculty will actively encourage students to work together on homework and laboratory assignments as well as seek additional team assignments to use in their courses.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Collaborative Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

Improve critical thinking skills
The department will continue to offer the Geoscience Learning Community course that it initiated in spring 2007. This course is a one credit hour course that involves entry level students in a research project that carries over from semester to semester. Students are permitted to enroll in the GLC for credit for two semesters. Students participating in the project are learning about sampling strategies and how to evaluate and synthesize data. These are all critical thinking tasks for scientists.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in Science and Geology
Improve oral communication

The biweekly seminar course (GEOL4095) which is a required course for the geology major, will be used as a format for explicitly teaching good oral communication skills. Each semester the seminar course will begin with a lecture on presentation skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Oral Communication Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Oral and Written Communication Skills

Improve quantitative skills

Faculty will seek to add quantitative assignments to their courses if the courses do not already include quantitative work.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Quantitative Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field

Provide space for student collaboration

The department will continue to maintain the undergraduate lounge as a place where students may study and work together.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Collaborative Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities

Revise rubric measures

The department will revise the rubric used for measures 1-11 to better resolve differences between students performing at level 3 and level 4. The new rubrics will also include information about how many students are performing above and below target levels.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Collaborative Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities
- Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in Science and Geology
- Measure: Field Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth History | Outcome/Objective: Earth and Solar System History
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth Processes | Outcome/Objective: Earth’s Internal and external processes
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution | Outcome/Objective: Physical Constitution of the Earth
- Measure: Oral Communication Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Oral and Written Communication Skills
- Measure: Professional Skills | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
- Skills common to geologic professionals
- Measure: Quantitative Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
- Measure: Technology Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field
- Measure: Written Work Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Oral and Written Communication Skills

Strengthen student’s knowledge base

Faculty will increase the level of their expectations for student performance and utilize strategies such as encouraging friendly competition or giving students pep talks to push students to achieve more.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Geology 1121 and 1122 laboratory test questions | Outcome/Objective: Earth and Solar System History
- Earth’s Internal and external processes | Physical Constitution of the Earth
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth History | Outcome/Objective: Earth and Solar System History
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth Processes | Outcome/Objective: Earth’s Internal and external processes
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution | Outcome/Objective: Physical Constitution of the Earth
**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 assessment 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 most 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 target performance levels, we are close to many of them. All of our students have the mapping and field skills that the faculty believes are important for working as a professional geologist. Performance on other learning outcomes is below our target levels (4 on our 5 point scale) but all exceed 3 on our 5 point scale. The results from measure 12, the analysis of GEOL 1121 and 1122 laboratory midterm and final exams, yielded results that were in line with other exams that were utilized during the summer of the year used last year, but the average scores on questions tied to learning outcomes changed by 1% or less for each learning outcome. This result reassures us that we have a robust and reproducible measure of the state of knowledge of students entering the major. A significant development this year is that the faculty has become more engaged in the learning outcomes and assessment process. During last year’s assessment cycle the geology faculty committed to 9 action plans. All of the action plans were completed and are described in detail below. Action 1: Increase written work. In accordance with the University’s QEP program the department implemented two writing courses (WAC) courses in the geology curriculum: GEOL4016 and GEOL4015. The plan to continue the WAC courses has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #1. Action 2: Improve Oral Communications. The faculty met and discussed how oral communication is currently taught and assessed in geoscience classes. It was agreed that faculty can help students to improve their oral communication skills by giving them feedback in the class room, for example asking a student to clarify or rephrase a vague question or statement. In addition the faculty decided that the biweekly seminar course (GEOL4095) which is a required course for the geology major, could be used as a format for explicitly teaching good oral communication skills. Each semester the seminar will begin with a lecture on presentation skills. This plan has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #2. Action 3: Improve Collaborative Skills. The department converted one of its classrooms into an undergraduate lounge complete with lockers for the students. The lounge serves as a space where students can sit and study during the day. By giving students a shared space as well as the responsibility for decorating and maintaining the space, it is facilitating communication between the students. In addition the faculty reviewed strategies for helping students improve their collaborative skills including giving them group projects, and encouraging students to work on homework and laboratory activities together. The plan to maintain the lounge and further encourage student collaboration has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Actions #4 & 5. Action 4: Improve Quantitative Skills. The faculty recognized that some courses already place a heavy emphasis on quantitative skills while others do not. It was decided that faculty whose course have little emphasis on quantitative skills will try to incorporate an emphasis on quantitative skills. The plan to continue the aforementioned action has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #6. Action 5: Improve technology skills. Faculty felt that student’s technology skills are improving as a consequence of greater exposure to technology in day to day life and that this is not a learning outcome that needs additional emphasis above and beyond what occurs naturally in geoscience courses. Action 6: Improve Critical Thinking Skills. The department initiated a program in spring 2007 called the Geoscience Learning Community. This course is a one credit hour course that involves entry level students in a research project that carries over from semester to semester. Students are permitted to enroll in the course for two semesters. Students are expected to enroll in the course for two semesters. The plan to continue the course has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #7. Action 7: Examine Learning Outcomes for the Geology Program. The learning outcomes for the geology program were revised to make the wording of some of the outcomes more consistent with their function as outcomes and to improve the connection of the outcomes to the learning in the classroom. New items were added to the outcomes to address several deficiencies in the area of “soft rock” geology. Faculty reviewed the revised learning outcomes and discussed in particular, the lack of coverage of outcome 8 in the required courses for the major. The faculty committed to thinking about the possibility of adding paleontology to the list of required courses for the major. The plan to consider adding paleontology as a required course is formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #8. The revised learning outcomes appear above in the learning outcomes section and were used as the basis for this year’s assessment.

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

Most of the scores on the rubrics are somewhat lower than the faculty’s target levels for minimum student performance. In particular that faculty would like to see the typical “C” student improve their writing, oral, and critical thinking skills. The faculty would also like to see improvements in our “C” student’s collaborative, quantitative, and technology skills as well as their command of geology content knowledge. The department is committed to continuing to strive for improvement in student performance and this is reflected in our action plans for next year. It may be pointed out that many of the rubric scores for this year are slightly lower than they were for last year. However, it must be kept in mind that with an average of 12-15 students per year in the major, natural fluctuations in the student population will cause yearly measures to “jump around”. In addition, our assessment rubric asks faculty to focus on the skills of entry level students in a research project that carries over from semester to semester. Students are permitted to enroll in the course for two semesters. Students are expected to enroll in the course for two semesters. The plan to continue the course has been formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #7. Action 9: Reexamine Learning Outcomes for Geology Program. The learning outcomes for the geology program were revised to make the wording of some of the outcomes more consistent with their function as outcomes and to improve the connection of the outcomes to the learning in the classroom. New items were added to the outcomes to address several deficiencies in the area of “soft rock” geology. Faculty reviewed the revised learning outcomes and discussed in particular, the lack of coverage of outcome 8 in the required courses for the major. The faculty committed to thinking about the possibility of adding paleontology to the list of required courses for the major. The plan to consider adding paleontology as a required course is formalized in this year’s action plan as Action #8. The revised learning outcomes appear above in the learning outcomes section and were used as the basis for this year’s assessment.
tease apart performance in the 3-4 range. A plan for considering these modifications is described in this year's action plan as Action #9.

---

**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. 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.

**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 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) for the following:

- a. The research project,
- b. Course based reports, oral presentations, and class discussions.

**Target for O1: Graduate knowledge and skills**

4 (Very Good)

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Partially Met

Two students graduated during this academic year from the Geology MS program under the non-thesis option and one graduated during AY05-06. The average scores for the three students are for part a: 3.3 (very good – good) and part b. 3.3 (very good – good).

**M 2: 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

Both students who graduated this year and five of the six students who graduated last year are employed full time as geologists. One student who graduate last year is enrolled in a geoscience PhD program.

**M 3: Faculty ratings for MS thesis students (O: 1)**

The thesis director of each 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 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

No students graduated with a MS thesis during this academic year. Following are the results for the 5 students that graduated
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The two students completing the requirements for the MS degree program in Geology matriculated 2003 and were employed full-time during their studies at GSU. Both students were admitted special status. They persevered and succeeded in completing the MS degree requirements (non-thesis option) in a good time. One of these two students passed the PG exam (both parts) on the first try in December 06 and this is an excellent outcome. One student needed two tries to complete the MS comprehensive exam. These successes show that non-geology students can complete a number of special status requirements and degree requirements on a timely basis while employed full-time and even succeeding in passing the PG exam. The returning student is a potential area of growth for increased numbers of students for this degree program. Following last year’s action plan, the geology faculty has completely rewritten the MS program learning outcomes. This extensive and detailed set of outcomes will form a robust foundation for future assessments of the program. As discussed in the action plan, a new set of measures will be developed to assess progress towards meeting the new outcomes. The new learning outcomes are as follows: A. General Skills General Learning Outcome 1: Each graduate shall have strong communication skills, both oral and written, including all of the following. A.1. Each graduate will be able to discuss geologic information in a manner consistent with professional expectations. A.2. Each graduate will be able to read and comprehend a scientific publication such as a USGS professional paper or scientific journal article and be able to comment on the significance of that paper relative to related papers in the geologic literature. A.3. Each graduate will be able to locate...
Mission / Purpose

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

Only two students completed degree requirements in this reporting period. In addition, a number of students who matriculated in 2002 (n=1) and 2003 (n=4) have not completed degree requirements. Reasons are varied. In a couple cases, their thesis director has moved to another university. Most of these five students were admitted special status and were enrolled full-time for a period of two years. All but one of these five students are now employed full-time (or close to full-time) making it more difficult to complete degree requirements. More attention is needed by both students and faculty supervisors alike on this issue. In addition, the total number of individuals that we are assessing is quite small, two this year and six last year. We will continue to aggregate and average our data.
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: 1, 3, 4, 5)
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

### O/O 2: Knowledge of the culture of germanic countries (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### O/O 3: Writing in German (M: 1, 2, 3, 6)
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

### O/O 4: Reading German (M: 1, 3, 6)
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: 4, 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: 1, 4, 5)**

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
2. Oral Communication--major
3. Critical Thinking--major
4. Contemporary Issues--core
5. Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
2. Interdisciplinary Programs
3. International Initiatives
4. Technology
5. Undergraduate Experience

---

**O/O 7: Ability to teach German language and cultures (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

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
4. Critical Thinking--major
5. Contemporary Issues--major
6. Quantitative Skills--major
7. Technology--major

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. Interdisciplinary Programs
2. Technology
3. Undergraduate Experience

---

**O/O 8: Understanding spoken German (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

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**

1. Oral Communication--major
2. Oral Communication--core
3. Collaboration--major
4. Collaboration--core

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. Technology

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Reading German (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)**

All German majors scored 4.81.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of German 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 in misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of the culture of Germanic 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong>: Writing in German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong>: Reading German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6</strong>: Knowledge of German business concepts and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong>: Ability to teach German language and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8</strong>: Understanding spoken German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

| M 2: Writing German (O: 3, 7, 8) |
| All German majors scored 4.43. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong>: Writing in German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong>: Ability to teach German language and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8</strong>: Understanding spoken German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met
### M 3: Knowledge of German literature (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

All German majors scored 4.18.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of German 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.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of the culture of germanic 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved since 2005-2006.

### M 4: Speaking German (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)

All German majors scored 4.88.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of German 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of the culture of germanic 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O5: Speaking 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O6: Knowledge of German 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O7: Ability to teach German 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O8: Understanding spoken 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### M 5: Understanding Spoken German (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)

ALL German majors scored 5.00.

### Target for O1: Knowledge of German literatures

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O2: Knowledge of the culture of germanic countries

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O5: Speaking German

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O6: Knowledge of German business concepts and context

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O7: Ability to teach German language and cultures

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O8: Understanding spoken German

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in
Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

M 6: Knowledge of German Literature (O: 2, 3, 4)
Students whose concentration was German literatures scored 4.75

Target for O2: Knowledge of the culture of Germanic countries
Target Performance Level was 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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.

Target for O3: Writing in German
Target Performance Level was 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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.

Target for O4: Reading German
Target Performance Level was 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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.

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?
Assessments show that German majors surpassed the goal of 4.0 in every area. They can speak, read, and write German at the level described, and their knowledge of literature is appropriate for BA candidates. In every area except literature, where the assessment results were exactly the same in the last two years, the overall scores increased significantly during the last year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Other assessments indicate that some native-speaking German majors may have gaps in their knowledge of culture. The German section is changing the curriculum in 3000-level courses to insure more exposure to cultural topics at this point.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 German MA
As of: 12/13/2016 03:03 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

### 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 2006-2007 - Target:** Met
FALL 2006: One student took the comprehensive examinations and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
FALL 2006: One student took the comprehensive examinations and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
FALL 2006: One student took the comprehensive examinations and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
FALL 2006: One student took the comprehensive examinations and completed a Non-Thesis Research Paper.

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Gerontology MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**
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 (M: 1, 2)**

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 (M: 1, 2)**

Students formulate research questions and formulate testable hypotheses. Students are able to analyze and interpret data (hypothesis testing, drawing inferences, formulating conclusions). Student 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 (M: 1, 2)**

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 (M: 1, 2)**

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 (M: 1, 2)**

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Review of Research or Administrative Internship (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

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 O1: Analytical Skills**

All completed administrative internships and research practica 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program's internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**

All completed administrative internships and research practica 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program's internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.
M 2: Review of Master`s Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

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).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program’s internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.

Target for O3: Communication Skills

All completed administrative internships and research practica 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program’s internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.

Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge

All completed administrative internships and research practica 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program’s internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.

Target for O5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions

All completed administrative internships and research practica 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students in the MA in Gerontology program are required to complete either a research practicum or an administrative internship, depending on which track they are pursuing (research or program administration). The program’s internship coordinator assessed each of 8 master’s students who have completed an administrative internship as part of their program, and 8 faculty evaluated 18 students who completed research practica. Of the administrative internship students, all were rated by the internship supervisor as either "Good" or "Excellent" on all learning objectives. The 13 research students were assessed by 4 different faculty who supervised them in their research practica. Although all learning objectives were met by most students (scored as at least 3 on a 4-point scale), none of the 13 objectives was met by all. Percentages of students meeting the objective ranged from 60% to 93%. The program was most successful in achieving objective 1.2 (The student has demonstrated appropriate analytic skills), and least successful in preparing students to "demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions" (objective 2.3). Although the typical objective was successfully reached by over 85% of students (12 of 14), we recognize that some students are falling short, and most are not achieving at the highest level.

M 2: Review of Master’s Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

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 O1: Analytical Skills

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Since the MA in Gerontology program is just now completing its third year, no previous assessment has been done. Six students completed the program in the past year and wrote and successfully defended a thesis. The faculty supervisors of these 6 students assessed how well their thesis project demonstrated the student’s progress toward the program’s stated learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least “good” on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only “good.” While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Since the MA in Gerontology program is just now completing its third year, no previous assessment has been done. Six students completed the program in the past year and wrote and successfully defended a thesis. The faculty supervisors of these 6 students assessed how well their thesis project demonstrated the student’s progress toward the program’s stated learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least “good” on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only “good.” While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.
learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least "good" on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only "good." While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Since the MA in Gerontology program is just now completing its third year, no previous assessment has been done. Six students completed the program in the past year and wrote and successfully defended a thesis. The faculty supervisors of these 6 students assessed how well their thesis project demonstrated the student’s progress toward the program’s stated learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least "good" on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only "good." While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Since the MA in Gerontology program is just now completing its third year, no previous assessment has been done. Six students completed the program in the past year and wrote and successfully defended a thesis. The faculty supervisors of these 6 students assessed how well their thesis project demonstrated the student’s progress toward the program’s stated learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least "good" on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only "good." While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.

**Target for O5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Since the MA in Gerontology program is just now completing its third year, no previous assessment has been done. Six students completed the program in the past year and wrote and successfully defended a thesis. The faculty supervisors of these 6 students assessed how well their thesis project demonstrated the student’s progress toward the program’s stated learning objectives. We are pleased that all students were judged at least "good" on all 13 learning objectives. On 4 objectives students were uniformly judged as excellent, while on the remaining 9 objectives, at least one or two students were assessed as only "good." While the program has met its minimum goals for student learning, we recognize much room for improvement.

**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

**Improve communication skills**

Students continue to struggle with written communication, especially international students. We plan to move the professionalization seminar formerly required in the second year to the first semester of the program and emphasize writing skills. While this course has been part of the program since the inception, it will now attempt to impress upon students the importance of good writing at the very start of their program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 12/1/07
**Improve knowledge about the profession**

Students have been encouraged to join and participate in professional associations to further their professionalization and knowledge of the field, but the cost of dues has often been a barrier. When students are able to attend these meetings and especially to present papers about their work, they learn how to engage in this important aspect of professional life and become more accomplished scholars. We will establish a fund to support student membership in these organizations, preparation of their research posters for presentation, and travel to meetings.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Review of Master's Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
- Communication Skills
- Review of Research or Administrative Internship | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
- Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** 5/1/07
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director
**Additional Resources:** While no resources are needed to begin the effort, outside funds will be needed to establish this fund.

**Improve qualitative methods skills**

Because much of the research in the Institute is qualitative, students must learn how to gather and analyze qualitative data. Since we require only one methods course, time devoted to qualitative methods is insufficient. Therefore, we plan to introduce a new elective course in Qualitative Methods. It will be taught first as a special topics course in the fall and then added to the permanent curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Review of Master's Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills
- Review of Research or Administrative Internship | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills

**Implementation Description:** 4/1/07
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

**Improve quantitative skills**

Our experience has been that many students enter the program with no background in statistics, and the one required course in research methods, in which statistics is taught, is not sufficient to prepare students for their thesis research. We plan to modify the entrance requirements to require students to show evidence of completion of a course in statistics or take an undergraduate course during their first semester enrolled.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Review of Master's Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills
- Review of Research or Administrative Internship | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills

**Implementation Description:** 12/1/07
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Now that our first students have graduated, we are pleased with several aspects of our program. We are very happy with student progress through the program. Half of the first class (3 of 6 still in the program) graduated in less than 2.5 years and 3 of the 8 students in the second year class finished their degree in less than 2 years. Of the remainder of class #1, one is expected to finish this summer, one (who had a major health problem) next spring, and one has withdrawn from the program. Given the mixture of full-time and part-time students in our program, this seems very reasonable amount of "time to degree." A second source of program strength has resulted from our Action Plan recruiting of 2 new faculty who are teaching several of the core courses. Although we still must rely on affiliate faculty in other departments to teach several of our required courses, the number of those is declining, and we are able to schedule all our courses so they are offered more regularly and in concert. Finally, as judged by their internship supervisors or research mentors, the large majority of our students are reaching the learning objectives we set for them. Although some of the research practicum assessments took place during the students' program (some even during the first year), rather than at the end, they show satisfactory levels of achievement and progress. All students completing the program by writing a thesis were judged to have reached all learning objectives and program goals. We also were pleased with how successful our policy of providing financial support for first-year students to attend the national association meeting in their first semester. This allowed them to become professionalized more quickly and learn much more about the content knowledge of the field than we could teach within the standard curriculum.

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

We are disappointed with the methodological and statistical skills our students are able to gain through the one course in research methods required of all students. Although research track students are required to have an additional methods course, it is clear that one course (or even two) is not sufficient to bring all students to the level of mastery we seek for the first two objectives (Analytical...
Skills Critical Thinking Skills). Also, we are impressed with how difficult it is for international students to adapt to both a new field of study and a new culture at the same time. We believe that a deeper and earlier orientation to the field and the profession during the first semester, along with more intensive training in both written and oral expression, would be helpful.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2006-2007 Health & Physical Education BSED**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The Health and Physical Education Program seeks to develop competent leaders who provide and promote health and physical activity in P-12 schools.

### 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**
- 2 Written Communication--core

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-eight percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 35 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 10 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 56% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 78% improving by 22%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All five program faculty using evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-eight percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 35 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 10 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 59% at target or above and 41% below target the 2006-07 candidates improved by 18%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-eight percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 35 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 10 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 48% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 78% improving by 30%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-eight percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 35 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 10 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 52% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 78% improving by 26%.

**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.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Fifty-three percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 24 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 21 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 56% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates dropped to 53% not improving by 3%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-eight percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 32 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 10 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 56% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 78%improving by 22%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Eighty-two percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 35 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 8 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 52% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 82%improving by 30%.

**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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument. Seventy-one percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 37 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 21 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 56% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates dropped to 53% not improving by 41%.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument.
Final Evaluation Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

- All five program faculty using portfolios, grades and evaluations from the two assigned cooperating teachers and other sources rated each teacher candidate at the end of student teaching using the KP Form of the INTASC Rating Instrument.
- Eighty-nine percent of the candidates scored at the Target or above level. There were 17 ratings at or above target (Level 4-Proficient or Level 5-Advanced). There were 2 ratings below target (Level 3-developing) Compared to the 2005-2006 ratings of 85% at target or above the 2006-07 candidates reached 89% improving by 4%.

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
- Relations (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 activites and assignments are appropriate and make changes when necessary.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relations (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
- Relations (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Implementation Description: Fall 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Jacalyn Lund

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
- Relations (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):
Add Test of Gross Motor Development to KH 3010
Students will be required to give the Test of Gross Motor Development (TGMD) to a group of 4 year olds as part of a class assignment in KH 3010 (Performance and Analysis: Movement and Rhythms). The results of this test will then be analyzed in KH 3410 (Assessment in Health and Physical Education).

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Terry Metzler - Summer 2007; Babs Greene - Fall 2007; Jacalyn Lund - Fall 2007

Additional Resources: Department will need to order two desk copies of the TGMD.

Continue to review new Content Knowledge Matrix.
Program faculty will review the new Content Knowledge Matrix that reflects the fall 2007 program changes including the new teacher education core.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Examine and review all program course syllabi
Program faculty will examine and review all course syllabi to determine that the objectives for each course relate to the New Content Knowledge Matrix.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Examine and review student teaching assignments
Program faculty will examine all student teaching assignments for relevancy. Assignments that are redundant and/or not related to a specific standard will be revised or eliminated.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: HPE program faculty and select cooperating teachers

Examine current program course of study
Program faculty will determine if program/course changes are needed at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Examine the Assessment Project
Program faculty and Mike Metzler will examine the data from the ongoing Assessment Project to determine if program changes are indicated.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Improve long term planning
Program faculty will design a series of assignments that occur over time in select courses so that students develop long term planning skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Include instructional strategies for diverse group
Program faculty will include additional instructional strategies for working with diverse populations in the following courses: KH 3200, 4510, 4520, 4530, 4540, 4710 and 4720.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Course instructors for each of the courses listed above.

Increase and improve the quality of reflection
HPE program faculty will examine the current reflection assignments in all courses for relevancy. Additional assignments will be added to appropriate classes. In addition to written reflection, students will be given an opportunity to verbally reflect during appropriate classes such as the student teaching seminars.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Require assignments for community involvement
Specific assignments to foster relationships with parents, colleagues and the community will be added to student teaching and other relevant courses. A service learning project will be added to a course or as a program requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Spring semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Revise assignment/s for KH 4650-Opening School
Students will be required to purchase "The First Days of School" by Harry Wong as the course textbook. Assignments will be related to readings from this text and other sources.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor - Terry Metzler

Revise assignments in KH 3410(Assessment in HPE)
Class and lab assignments will be aligned with the models projects from KH 4510, 4520, 4530 and student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor for KH 3410 - Jacalyn Lund

Students will use observation software in classes
Student teachers will be required to use the observation software during KH 4710 and 4720 (student teaching).

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Teacher education based labs in science classes
HPE program faculty will work with exercise science faculty and department chair to design labs that are more appropriate for teacher education majors in KH 3650 and KH 3600. The department will offer a lab section for each of these courses for only HPE majors.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HPE and Exercise Science faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The BSE HPE program showed excellent progress across 8 out of the 10 Knowledge and Performance (KP) standards with all but one of the 8 reaching above our target level of 75%. Five standards (Standard 1, 2, 3, 4, & 6) were met at 78%; Standard 7 at 82%; Standard 10 at 89% and Standard 9 at 91%. On the standards showing improvement the range in improvement per standard over 2005-06 went from 5% to 41%. Standard 8 (Evaluates) is the standard that improved the most from 2005-06 up from 30% to 71%. Although we didn't reach the target level of 75% we felt that implementing the actions number 8 and 9 from last year's action plan for this standard led to the increase. We were able through a program change to include a course (KH 3410) for majors dedicated to assessment in HPE and we were also able to consistently begin to include assessment/evaluation assignments in all appropriate classes. Another strength was the HPE faculty's development of a Content Knowledge Matrix (action #1) to improve student content knowledge (Standard 1) and understanding of how children learn (Standard 2). Action #2 (Examine KH 3610 and KH 4540) actually became a part of Action #1 (Review Content Knowledge). This matrix helped us start to pinpoint some weak areas/courses that we
were able to act on during fall 2006 and spring 2007. Action #3 (Review and add teaching strategies to courses) led us to add assignments related to teaching strategies for diverse learners in KH 3200. Action #4 (Require Models Based Instruction) led us to increase the number of models-based instructional projects in student teaching from 1 to 2 and to increase the total amount of time students spent using models-based instruction throughout student teaching. Action #6 (Increase PE Technology strategies in KH 3100) led to another key improvement on Standard 6 (Communicates) increasing not only the use of technology for physical education in KH 3100 but also led to an increase in use in other appropriate courses throughout the year (KH420, KH4510, 4520, 4710 and 4720). Action #7 (Review planning requirements in selected courses) led to an improvement on Standard 7 (Plans and Integrates) from 52% to 82%. Program faculty feel that the decision to increase the number of assignments related to planning in KH 3200, 3010, 4710 and 4720 led to this significant increase. The Dispositions Standards forINTASC showed similar progress as well. Eight out of the 10 standards improved from 2% - 32%. Standard 9 (Values Management) remained the same and Standard 9 (Values Reflection) decreased by 12%. We are pleased with the progress made this year and truly believe that even the smallest of changes and attention to the program have made impact in positive ways on meeting the stated outcomes and objectives of the program.

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

In the Knowledge and Performance (KP) standards we did not meet our stated outcomes on two standards. However, we feel that all areas need continued attention and specific action items. On Standard 5 (Manages and Motivates) we actually had a 3% decrease from 56% to 53%. Even though we identified several excellent sources (Action #5 - Review current literature on class management) to help students with classroom management, we did not require students to use these resources. For 2007-08 a specific resource will be required for all students in KH4650 (Opening School) and KH 4710 and 4720 (Student Teaching). There will also be specific assignments related to classroom management in these courses along with specific assignments in KH 3200, 4510, 4520, 4530 and 4540 (Instructional Block). Although we didn’t meet the target level of 75% on Standard 8 (Evaluates) we felt that the action plan #8 (Increase content knowledge on assessment for HPE and #9 (Add assessment requirement to classes) did work because we made the greatest amount of improvement in this area. Moving from 30% to 71%. We are sure that with a revision of course assignments in KH 3410 (Assessment in HPE) to align those assignments with other assignments in the instructional block classes and with assessment assignments in student teaching that our students will easily improve in this area next year. Standard 9 (Reflects on Practice) is one standard that we met but had a slight decrease from last year from 100% to 91%. Our plan (action #10 - Maintain current level of professional reflection) was actually met with the 91%. We feel that the decrease is due to less time spent in student teaching seminars on reflection. Our plan for next year is to return to the same level of active reflection in the seminars as in previous years and to add reflection assignments to other classes. One interesting finding was that for Standard 10 (Participates in the Professional Community) our students were rated high because ratings of 0 or “Not Assessed” were filtered out. The report. We feel that the high rating of 89% for this year or the 84% reported for last year does not accurately reflect what actually is occurring in the program. As a result, we will be adding specific assignments to the instructional block classes and student teaching to improve students participation in the school community with colleagues, parents and other community agencies. Although we met our target level of 75% for standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 we are working on improving in all of these areas. HPE program faculty will examine and review all course syllabi and the HPE Content Knowledge Matrix with the goal of aligning the objectives with the matrix. The Test of Gross Motor Development will be added to KH3010 to infuse assessment into another key course. Assignments for student teaching will be reviewed for relevancy to help improve Standard 4 and other related standards. The HPE faculty will work together to provide exercise science and biomechanics labs specifically designed for the needs of physical education teachers. We are hoping that this will help HPE students improve Standard 1 (Content Knowledge) and ultimately lead to improvement on Standard 2 (Understands Development) and Standard 4 (Designs Instructional Strategies). HPE program faculty will examine the current program and determine if course or program changes need to be submitted to improve any or all of the standards. Students and key faculty members will begin using the observation software developed this year specifically designed to be used with models based instruction. This should lead to improvement on Standard 6 (Communicates), Standard 7 (Plans and Integrates) and a big improvement on Standard 9 (Reflects on Practice). Assignments based on instructional strategies for diverse learners will be increased in key courses and added to other appropriate courses. Assignments related to long term planning will be added to key courses to improve Standard 7 (Plans and Integrates). We have discovered with the data provided us at the end of this year regarding disposition that we need to have a plan in place to help our students meet the target level of 75% for Standard 5 (Values management and safe learning environments) and Standard 9 (Values Self Reflection). Since these two areas fall in line with the findings for the KP Standards, we believe that the addition of assignments to the key classes mentioned previously and infusing reflection throughout appropriate classes will also lead to our students improving on these two disposition standards.
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Mission / Purpose
The Health and Physical Education Program seeks to develop competent leaders who provide and promote health and physical activity in P-12 schools.

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

**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**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
86.11% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 2: 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**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
75% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
83.33% of the students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty STARTS 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
79.17% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
79.17% 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*
Building collegiality
Incorporate an online discussion into EDUC 8360
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Summer 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund

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 ratings | 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: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Health and Physical Education program faculty

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: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch

Develop a matrix for the graduate program
Faculty will define what is taught in each required course in the graduate program and put this onto a matrix. Faculty will then be able to see which content areas are covered and which will need additional work/attention.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 ratings | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 rating | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HPE faculty members

Improve research skills
Students will complete an assignment that requires them to synthesize research in the area of health and physical education.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARTS Standard 4 rating | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund

Involve students in program research projects
Students are required to complete an action research project prior to graduating from the program. Program faculty are engaged in a longitudinal study of effectiveness. Graduate students will take roles in this research project. They will have the opportunity to improve their own research skills as they work with senior researchers on the project.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating | Outcome/Objective: Participates in profession’s learning communities
Measure: Faculty STARTS Standard 4 rating | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Drs. Metzler, Gurvitch, and Lund
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Although some of the actual percentages for the various outcomes decreased from 2006, there actually were more students in the program and therefore more students achieving mastery of the content. Last year our action plan included adding ways to involve students in the professional learning community. To that end, students were required to respond to an issues section of our professional journal and participate in online discussions during a web-based course. Action 1 and 3 were thus met. Additionally, program faculty continued monitoring student progress in the program. A new course was added to the electives for students without initial certification. That was a positive change and the competence of students in subsequent courses was much better. Again, this was not necessarily reflected in the total percentages of students obtaining acceptable levels of competency, but is reflected in the actual number of students achieving desired levels of competency. This change probably won't be reflected in the data until after these students complete the program (one more year). The way the program is currently configured, a teacher employed in the school can complete the program in approximately 2 years. By compressing the time for completion, the experience is more meaningful for participants. Also, we are starting to use our graduate students to supervise our undergraduate student teachers. This has been a very positive benefit of the graduate program. Not only do our undergraduate students benefit from the guidance of our graduate students, but the graduate students have the opportunity to demonstrate leadership, which is one of the goals of the program.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There is concern for Standard 5, participation in a profession's learning communities. The action plan proposes involving graduate students in program research. By building a research team, students will have the opportunity to learn from colleagues and see how to address problems/issues in the schools. Last year, several items were added to improve collegiality. With greater numbers in the program, this is an area that we will continue to address and try to improve. Additionally, the program will continue to monitor student competence and ability to teach. Lastly, the program will continue to look for ways to teach students to advocate for the profession through assignments and projects as students complete their programs.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Health Administration MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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 sector 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 assmnt 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

**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
### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
Student feedback on residency and for CAHME is strength

#### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
Preceptor evaluation of students in Spring 2007 above 4.0

#### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
SEIP average above 4.0 in Spring 2007

#### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
3.58 GPA for AY 2004-AY2006

#### 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 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
100 percent in CAHME external reviewers report in January 2007

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Preceptor evaluation of resident performance above 4.0 in Spring 2007

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

HA faculty assessment of residents was above 4.0 in Spring 2007

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

This is difficult to measure, but preceptors indicate it was met in Spring 2007

### 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:** H.A. 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 CAHME external reviewers and GSU APR committee listed some of the strengths as: continuous CAHME accreditation (max 6 years in 2007), very responsive faculty, B-school location and joint MBA/MHA program, alumni committed, student quality improvement, centrality is high, committed students, high student retention and placement, research consistent with faculty size, well-qualified faculty, exciting opportunity in health informatics.
**Annual Report Section Responses**

### Executive Summary

IHA is widely recognized for its flagship MBA/MHA program and is nationally ranked (8th MBA part-time and 34th HA nationally, U.S. News & World Report, 2007). IHA was awarded the maximum 6 year accreditation in 2007 by the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME). IHA is a full graduate member of the Association of University Programs in Health Administration and is part of the Robinson College of Business, accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. The Institute is the only health management program in Georgia with these accreditations and memberships.

### Contributions to the Institution

- **IHA alumni number over 1,200 and are in executive management positions throughout the U.S.** (e.g., Chair-elect of the American Hospital Association, Chicago, IL; CEO of Catholic Health Initiatives, Denver, CO; President of Omidiyar (eBay's $ multi-billion Foundation), Redwood City, CA; President, Central Group, HCA, Nashville, TN; CEO of Tampa General Hospital, Tampa, FL; CEO of Eastern Maine Health System, Bangor, ME). Many health system CEOs and administrators in Georgia and in Southeast are GSU/IHA graduates (e.g., President of GAHA, CEO of Habersham County Medical Center, CEO of Floyd Medical Center), with numerous management positions. The Institute is approved by more states (8) for in-state tuition than any other graduate health administration program by the Academic Common Market of the 16 state Southern Regional Education Board. •IHA conducts vital health services research and policy for State of Georgia in such areas as evaluation of statewide Medicaid program, quality, information systems, long-term care, and the uninsured. •IHA conducts extensive extramurally funded research and served as principal investigators on $7 million contracts/grants in recent years, providing considerable funds for indirect cost recovery for GSU, RCB, and IHA as well faculty support, benefits, and course releases. numerous international activities.

### Highlights

- Accredited by CAHME for the maximum 6 years. Successful alumni. Extensive extramurally funded and published research. State of GA research and support of legislative committees.

### Challenges

- Realize the potential for increasing our national prominence (by recruiting more faculty and additional resources). Pursue the exciting potential of a health informatics program. Develop a focused strategic plan and ACTION PLAN. Increase extramural funding. Establish a HA cohort in the PMBA. Improve publications in peer reviewed journals.

### Teaching Activities

- Recognized nationally for its flagship MBA/MHA program. Blended on-line course. High SEIP scores.

### Research and Scholarly Activities

- IHA conducts extensive extramurally funded research and served as principal investigators on $7 million contracts/grants in recent years, providing considerable funds for indirect cost recovery for GSU, RCB, and IHA as well faculty support, benefits, and course releases. Completed three comprehensive evaluations of Georgia Better Health Care, the statewide Medicaid managed care delivery program, analysis of HMO encounter data systems, assessments of long-term care in Georgia, and survey of HMO quality measures in Georgia. Also, completed two evaluations of the Preadmission Screening and Resident Review Program (nursing homes). Assessed the patterns of health insurance coverage and uninsured in Georgia under a State Planning Grant awarded to Georgia by the U.S. DHSS/HRSA. •Faculty have published in such top journals as: New England Journal of Medicine, Health Services Research, Medical Care, Health Affairs, Inquiry, Journal of Risk and Insurance, Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Health Care Management Review, Journals of: HA Education, Healthcare Management, Healthcare Financial Management Research, Rehabilitation Administration, American Dental Association, Hospitals and Health Networks, and Social Science in Medicine. Faculty cited in news such as AP, Reuters, New York Times, USA Today, Atlanta Business Chronicle, Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Baltimore Sun, Financial Times, and St. Petersburg Times.

### Public/Community Service

- Chair serves on Board of Directors of national academic association, and a professor serves on the national Health services research planning committee. ALPHA Faculty (e.g., Bill Custer, Pat Ketsche, Andy Summer) and Executive-in-Residence (Bernie Brown, Brue Chandler, Marie Cameron) have served on several State of Georgia legislative and executive branch committees such as: the General Assembly's Task Force on Health Insurance Options for Small Businesses and Uninsured Workers, the Healthcare Coverage Project funded by State Planning Grant - Healthcare Coverage Project, Chair of the Medicaid Administration Committee, and Chair of the GA Board for Physician Workforce. Faculty participate in national sessions for health policymakers.

### International Activities

- Long history of international collaborations: in early 1980s HA education of Saudis; in 1990s with Rotary International (North GA District) conducted health management and policy symposium held at Sechenov First Moscow Medical Academy. Hosted several healthcare executives from the former Soviet Union at GSU and at national associations. Currently collaborating with USAID, AHA, PhD, and Emory University in the establishment of a Certificate in Health Management Education in Tbilisi, Georgia, healthcare partnerships, as well as collaborations with the University of Nantes, France. •IHA is expanding the focus on entrepreneurship in healthcare, given the changing direction of the healthcare industry. Several GSU/RCB/IHA alumni hold leadership positions in the for-profit healthcare sector. •IHA offers a popular undergraduate Perspectives course on International Comparative Health Systems.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In the past year, six students successfully completed projects, three students successfully completed theses, and seven students successfully completed portfolios. The division has developed a rubric to begin tracking development of student proposals for theses and research-focused projects. The proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of beginning their individual academic effort. Further, they do not have as much faculty input as the final theses and project reports. The rubric includes the following areas: research hypothesis and objectives clearly stated in the proposal; introduction provides a historical context and literature review of the thesis/project topic; materials and methods clearly stated, well-conceived, and scientifically accurate; compliance issues; and writing mechanics. Scores are exemplary (5 points), proficient (3 points), needs improvement (1 point) and unacceptable (0 points). The faculty members who teach the research methods courses evaluated two proposals (one thesis and one project) that were selected based on availability to test the rubric for usability. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. The proposals tested scored (total) 10/25 (needs improvement for "Materials and Methods" and unacceptable for "Compliance") and 18/25 (proficient in all areas).

#### Target for O2: Demonstrate communication skills

Meets requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In the past year, six students successfully completed projects, three students successfully completed theses, and seven students successfully completed portfolios. The division has developed a rubric to begin tracking development of student proposals for theses and research-focused projects. The proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of beginning their individual academic effort. Further, they do not have as much faculty input as the final theses and project reports. The rubric includes the following areas: research hypothesis and objectives clearly stated in the proposal; introduction provides a historical context and literature review of the thesis/project topic; materials and methods clearly stated, well-conceived, and scientifically accurate; compliance issues; and writing mechanics. Scores are exemplary (5 points), proficient (3 points), needs improvement (1 point) and unacceptable (0 points). The faculty members who teach the research methods courses evaluated two proposals (one thesis and one project) that were selected based on availability to test the rubric for usability. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. The proposals tested scored (total) 10/25 (needs improvement for "Materials and Methods" and unacceptable for "Compliance") and 18/25 (proficient in all areas).

#### Target for O3: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans

Meets requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In the past year, six students successfully completed projects, three students successfully completed theses, and seven students successfully completed portfolios. The division has developed a rubric to begin tracking development of student proposals for theses and research-focused projects. The proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of beginning their individual academic effort. Further, they do not have as much faculty input as the final theses and project reports. The rubric includes the following areas: research hypothesis and objectives clearly stated in the proposal; introduction provides a historical context and literature review of the thesis/project topic; materials and methods clearly stated, well-conceived, and scientifically accurate; compliance issues; and writing mechanics. Scores are exemplary (5 points), proficient (3 points), needs improvement (1 point) and unacceptable (0 points). The faculty members who teach the research methods courses evaluated two proposals (one thesis and one project) that were selected based on availability to test the rubric for usability. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. The proposals tested scored (total) 10/25 (needs improvement for "Materials and Methods" and unacceptable for "Compliance") and 18/25 (proficient in all areas).
in applying student research methods coursework and of beginning their individual academic effort. Further, they do not have as much faculty input as the final theses and project reports. The rubric includes the following areas: research hypothesis and objectives clearly stated in the proposal; introduction provides a historical context and literature review of the thesis/project topic; materials and methods clearly stated, well-conceived, and scientifically accurate; compliance issues; and writing mechanics. Scores are exemplary (5 points), proficient (3 points), needs improvement (1 point) and unacceptable (0 points).

The faculty members who teach the research methods courses evaluated two proposals (one thesis and one project) that were selected based on availability to test the rubric for usability. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. The proposals tested scored (total) 10/25 (needs improvement for "Materials and Methods" and unacceptable for "Compliance") and 18/25 (proficient in all areas).

### M 2: Coursework – Advanced Normal Nutrition (O: 4)

Examinations and projects (grades) from Advanced Normal Nutrition courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% or better score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All graduate students met this objective.

### M 3: Coursework – Trends (O: 5)

Examinations and projects (grades) from Health Trends courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Evaluate health policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% or better score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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

#### Discuss plan to integrate content with experience

The Advanced Normal Nutrition area was expanded this year from one course to two courses to expand content coverage. Students who are in internship experiences have reported that they do not have as much time as "traditional" graduate students to study the theoretical concepts. We will discuss developing some practice-based experiences that will integrate more theory to deepen the understanding and time on topic for interns. We will also see whether the integration helps "traditional" students apply information more effectively. We anticipate measuring these activities using case studies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Coursework – Advanced Normal Nutrition
  - Outcome/Objective: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health

**Implementation Description:**
- April 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Meera Penumetcha/Barbara Hopkins

#### Implement rubric for evaluating proposals

The rubric for evaluating proposals was developed and tested for usability in 2006/7. It will be implemented during the 2007/8 academic year for all proposals. The information from this evaluation will be used to improve the research methods courses that students take and to improve final theses and project reports.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **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:**
- September 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Mildred Cody)
## Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Our students are performing well in their content courses and are meeting requirements for their capstone experiences.

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

The limited usability study for the thesis/project proposal rubrics showed that proposals can be strengthened in specific ways. We anticipate that continued use of the rubric will help to strengthen the research methods courses and the resulting capstone experiences of students.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2006-2007 History BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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

- **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

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

#### SLO 3: 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.

- **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**
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**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Professional Values**
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**
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.

**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 70% or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Based on review of 2005-2006 findings, the department raised the bar for student achievement from an evaluative grade of
60% or higher to 70% or higher. During the fall semester of 2006, the department selected four sections of History 1111: The World to 1500 to assess the goal 2.b. Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. To a question addressing expansion through wars of defense with topic of "defensive imperialism" and the necessity to convince the "public" of a "just war," 89% of students in section one answered the question correctly, 82% did so in section two, 87% in section three, and 88% in section four. The department selected four sections of History 1112—The World Since 1500—to assess the goal 2.b. Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. To a question addressing an explanation of the most important and influential historical development, event, movement, or person in the world during the period from 1500 to the present, 100% of the students in section one answered the question correctly (with a C or better), 89% of the students in section two did so, 98% did so in section three, and 87% in section four. The department selected four sections of History 2110—Survey in United State History—to assess the goal 2.b. Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. To a choice among questions addressing the expansion of democracy, class warfare, imperialism, and wars of the past twenty years, 86% of the students in section one answered the correction correctly (with a C or better), 80% of the students in section two did so, 66% did so in section three, and 69% in section four.

M2: 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 a historical problem within an historical context.

Target for O2: Historiography

1. The student, knowing that history is the interpretation of data, can demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data. 2. The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art, literature, psychology, philosophy, statistics, dependent upon their area of specialization. 3. The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses. 4. Student is able to employ methods of historical research and modes of historical discourses that help student 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. 5. 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

On balance, graduating seniors are meeting upper division History Standards adopted by the department in January 2003. These standards are: professional skills, historiography, interdisciplinary awareness, comparative/global/transnational perspective, and professional values. The committee noted that one 4990 essay received an award by the university as the best paper at its first Undergraduate Research Conference. While meeting all standards, the student who wrote this essay showed particular sensitivity to comparative/global/transnational perspective in her work on the politics of commemoration in Shi'i Islam. The committee also singled out for commendation a student who wrote a sophisticated economic and cultural analysis of Farm Security Administration photographs in America’s culture of abundance and another student who incorporated newspaper sources creatively in a study of the ways in which African Americans commemorated West Indian emancipation during the period before the end of American slavery. Some of the 4990 essays revealed weaknesses. One essay was plagiarized and received a failing grade. Several did not incorporate an adequate number of primary sources, while a few failed to synthesize primary and secondary sources adequately. Several papers showed that students struggled in trying to develop an argument.

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

Assess relationship between History 3000 and 4990

The committee makes the following recommendations for strengthening our program. History 3000(Introduction to Historical Studies) and History 4990(Historical Research) are the department's “bookend” courses for majors. We propose a series of pedagogical workshops to discuss the challenges of teaching these courses. Topics to be addressed would include: course goals and teaching methodologies *style manuals and their uses *primary sources and their incorporation into writing assignments *rubrics of different professors for evaluating student work *technology and its uses for research and writing *plagiarism and its prevention, including through the use of electronic services. Second, the committee proposes that the department revisit strengthening the links between History 3000 and History 4990, and indeed strengthening the links between its 3000-4000 level courses and its capstone senior seminar. How might our undergraduate courses do a better job in preparing students for History 4990? In 2005-2006, the Undergraduate Studies Committee won approval from department members to modify the numbering system of the department's undergraduate courses. We now define 3000-level courses as broad across time and space and 4000-level courses as more narrowly focused. The new system links our 4000-level courses more intimately to History 4990, and has made our course offerings more understandable for students. One student this year wrote an independent study essay (History 4970) in lieu of History 4990. Satisfactory completion of the course entitles the student to graduate "with distinction in history." Do we wish to encourage others among our especially gifted students to take this approach, bypassing 4990, in favor of working one-on-one with a faculty member?
Change assessment from end-of-program to courses

The subcommittee concluded that to some extent the different levels of achievement reflect the differences in ability and application of individual students. Although it is conducted with the advice and mentorship of a faculty advisor, a thesis or dissertation is a highly individualized piece of work that must be original and must be carried out by the student independently. Our primary challenge, therefore, is to equip students with the skills that best prepare them to internalize disciplinary and professional standards and to meet them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process of skill-building before students get to the thesis/dissertation stage. We concluded that there are some things we could do to better equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage. The graduate committee recently instituted a requirement that all students take at least one research seminar(as opposed to a readings seminar) as a regular part of their coursework before beginning the thesis or dissertation. Although such seminars were available in the past, not all students have taken them, and we could see a very distinct difference in the work of students who had completed a research seminar and students who hadn't. An opportunity to exercise the skills associated with original research by writing an article-length piece in the structured environment of a weekly course clearly improved student outcomes. We felt this was an important intermediate step all students should attempt before undertaking a lengthy, long-term research project independently. The committee also concluded that there was some disparity in students' skills at synthesizing secondary literature and integrating alternative arguments and/or theoretical viewpoints into their own writing. To address this, we are going to bring the issue to the attention of our graduate faculty and incorporate formal course-level assessment of these skills as students move through their coursework. In conducting our analysis, the graduate studies committee concluded that there were actually two important points in a graduate student's career when it would be constructive to assess outcomes: 1) at the course level, when students are learning the basic skills they will deploy in the thesis or dissertation, and 2) at the thesis/dissertation level when they are applying these skills to an independent piece of research. We concluded that it would be useful to alternate assessment of learning outcomes between these two points. Since we evaluated theses and dissertations this year, next year we plan to focus our assessment at the graduate course level. The graduate studies committee will examine end-of-semester writing assignments and re-write the forms that professors use as end-of-course evaluations of individual students to include evaluation of skills associated with synthesis and integration of other arguments. These procedures will provide new data for our assessment of learning outcomes next year. This should also help us to stress essential skill-building at a critical, early stage in graduate training, and determine how effective course-level reforms are, and track progress among our graduates.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

On balance, graduating seniors are meeting upper division History Standards adopted by the department in January 2003. These standards are: professional skills, historiography, interdisciplinary awareness, comparative/global/transnational perspective, and professional values. The committee noted that one 4990 essay received an award by the university as the best paper at its first Undergraduate Research Conference. While meeting all standards, the student who wrote this essay showed particular sensitivity to comparative/global/transnational perspective in her work on the politics of commemoration in Shi'i Islam. The committee also singled out for commendation a student who wrote a sophisticated economic and cultural analysis of Farm Security Administration photographs in America's culture of abundance and another student who incorporated newspaper sources creatively in a study of the ways in which African Americans commemorated West Indian emancipation during the period before the end of American slavery.

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

Some of the 4990 essays revealed weaknesses. One essay was plagiarized and received a failing grade. Several did not incorporate an adequate number of primary sources, while a few failed to synthesize primary and secondary sources adequately. Several papers showed that students struggled in trying to develop an argument. The committee makes the following recommendations for strengthening our program. History 3000 (Introduction to Historical Studies) and History 4990 (Historical Research) are the department's "bookend" courses for majors. We propose a series of pedagogical workshops to discuss the challenges of teaching these courses.
program will be able to analyze conflicting information and viewpoints, write clearly and communicate ideas, find reliable evidence for judgments about human actions and motives, and place particular events in a wider context or historical pattern. Graduates are prepared not only to be competent historians and teachers but to function successfully in the larger community, both within and outside the academy. The Department thus seeks to prepare students for future careers, for the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society, and for the uncertainties that one encounters in relations to others.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Professional Skill (M: 1)

These are the basic skillings involved in conducting and presenting historical research, techniques and methods of archival/primary material research, synthesis and analysis of secondary material, organization and historical argumentation, etc.

**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

#### SLO 2: Historiography (M: 2)

This involves awareness of existing arguments and historical literature - both empirical and theoretical - pertaining to a specific project or problem of historical research is a requirement for successful historical research/writing.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

The student will be aware of the relations between historical research/writing and work in the other disciplines, especially those in the humanities and social sciences, and be able to employ theories and methods from these disciplines where appropriate to enrich historical research/writing.

**O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**

To avoid as far as is possible the parochial historians must incorporate and/or test their theories, methods, and conclusions as appropriate against those developed for other/in other historical time periods and culture areas.

**O/O 5: Professional Values**

Students must become aware of and internalize professional standards for research, argumentation, and use of secondary works. This involves, among other questions, definitions and recognition of plagiarism and the unattributed use of the work of colleagues and students.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Knowledge Acquisition (O: 1)

An oral exam at the conclusion of coursework assesses acquisition of knowledge in three particular 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.

**Target for O1: Professional Skill**

90% successful completion rate

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The graduate committee decided to initiate its assessment of knowledge acquisition by reviewing theses of masters students in 2006-2007, rather than getting reports from the chairs of the oral examination committees. After examining the theses, our committee concluded that graduate students are meeting the History Department standards. For the most part these works suggest that our students are well prepared to continue doing professional historical research and that they have mastered the skills and knowledge appropriate to the discipline.

#### 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: Historiography**

Successful pass rate of 90%

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students met our first standard for "professional skills," which encompasses basic skills in conducting and presenting original historical research. Although there was a wide variation in the kinds of sources used, all theses and dissertations demonstrated that students were capable of conducting primary research, interpreting primary documents, evaluating
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
- 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
- Implementation Description: Spring 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Change assessment from end-of-program to courses
The subcommittee concluded that to some extent the different levels of achievement reflect the differences in ability and application of individual students. Although it is conducted with the advice and mentorship of a faculty advisor, a thesis or dissertation is a highly individualized piece of work that must be original and must be carried out by the student independently. Our primary challenge, therefore, is to equip students with the skills that best prepare them to internalize disciplinary and professional standards and to meet them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process of skill-building before students get to the thesis/dissertation stage. We concluded that there are some things we could do to better equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage.

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: May 2008
- 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 subcommittee concluded that to some extent the different levels of achievement reflect the differences in ability and application of individual students. Although it is conducted with the advice and mentorship of a faculty advisor, a thesis or dissertation is a highly individualized piece of work that must be original and must be carried out by the student independently. Our primary challenge, therefore, is to equip students with the skills that best prepare them to internalize disciplinary and professional standards and to meet them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process of skill-building before students get to the thesis/dissertation stage.

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

We concluded that there are some things we could do to better equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage. The graduate committee recently instituted a requirement that all students take at least one research seminar (as opposed to a readings seminar) as a regular part of their coursework before beginning the thesis or dissertation. Although such seminars were available in the past, not all students have taken them, and we could see a very distinct difference in the work of students who had completed a research seminar and students who hadn't. An opportunity to exercise the skills associated with original research by writing an article-length piece in the structured environment of a weekly course clearly improved student outcomes. We felt this was an important intermediate step all students should attempt before undertaking a lengthy, long-term research project independently. The committee also concluded that there was some disparity in students' skills at synthesizing secondary literature and integrating alternative arguments and/or theoretical viewpoints into their own writing. To address this, we are going to bring the issue to the attention of our graduate faculty and incorporate formal course-level assessment of these skills as students move through their coursework. In conducting our analysis, the graduate studies committee concluded that there were actually two important points in a graduate student's career when it would be constructive to assess outcomes: 1) at the course level, when students are learning the basic skills they will deploy in the thesis or dissertation, and 2) at the thesis/dissertation level when they are applying these skills to an independent piece of research. We concluded that it would be useful to alternate assessment of learning outcomes between these two points. Since we evaluated theses and dissertations this year, next year we plan to focus our assessment at the graduate course level. The graduate studies committee will examine end-of-course writing and re-write the forms that professors use as end-of-course evaluations of individual students to include evaluation of skills associated with synthesis and integration of other arguments. These procedures will provide new data for our assessment of learning outcomes next year. This should also help us to stress essential skill-building at a critical, early stage in graduate training, and determine how effective course-level reforms are, and track progress among our graduates.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 History PhD**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:03 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 (M: 2)**

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, 2)**

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**
The committee also concluded that there was some disparity in students' skills at synthesizing secondary literature and integrating an important intermediate step all students should attempt before undertaking a lengthy, long-term research project independently. Writing an article-length piece in the structured environment of a weekly course clearly improved student outcomes. We felt this was completed a research seminar and students who hadn't. An opportunity to exercise the skills associated with original research by available in the past, not all students have taken them, and we could see a very distinct difference in the work of students who had readings seminar) as a regular part of their coursework before beginning the thesis or dissertation. Although such seminars were stage. The graduate committee recently instituted a requirement that all students take at least one research seminar (as opposed to a equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage. We concluded that there are some things we could do to better them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process therefore, is to equip students with the skills that best prepare them to internalize disciplinary and professional standards and to meet them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process skill-building before students get to the thesis/dissertation stage. We concluded that there are some things we could do to better equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage. The graduate committee recently instituted a requirement that all students take at least one research seminar (as opposed to a readings seminar) as a regular part of their coursework before beginning the thesis or dissertation. Although such seminars were available in the past, not all students have taken them, and we could see a very distinct difference in the work of students who had completed a research seminar and students who hadn't. An opportunity to exercise the skills associated with original research by writing an article-length piece in the structured environment of a weekly course clearly improved student outcomes. We felt this was an important intermediate step all students should attempt before undertaking a lengthy, long-term research project independently. The committee also concluded that there was some disparity in students' skills at synthesizing secondary literature and integrating...
alternative arguments and/or theoretical viewpoints into their own writing. To address this, we are going to bring the issue to the attention of our graduate faculty and incorporate formal course-level assessment of these skills as students move through their coursework. In conducting our analysis, the graduate studies committee concluded that there were actually two important points in a graduate student's career when it would be constructive to assess outcomes: 1) at the course level, when students are learning the basic skills they will deploy in the thesis or dissertation, and 2) at the thesis/dissertation level when they are applying these skills to an independent piece of research. We concluded that it would be useful to alternate assessment of learning outcomes between these two points. Since we evaluated theses and dissertations this year, next year we plan to focus our assessment at the graduate course level. The graduate studies committee will examine end-of-course writing and re-write the forms that professors use as end-of-course evaluations of individual students to include evaluation of skills associated with synthesis and integration of other arguments. These procedures will provide new data for our assessment of learning outcomes next year. This should also help us to stress essential skill-building at a critical, early stage in graduate training, and determine how effective course-level reforms are, and track progress among our graduates.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The subcommittee concluded that to some extent the different levels of achievement reflect the differences in ability and application of individual students. Although it is conducted with the advice and mentorship of a faculty advisor, a thesis or dissertation is a highly individualized piece of work that must be original and must be carried out by the student independently. Our primary challenge, therefore, is to equip students with the skills that best prepare them to internalize disciplinary and professional standards and to meet them independently in their own research. Assessment should therefore also attempt capture how well we are doing in that process of skill-building before students get to the thesis/dissertation stage.

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

We concluded that there are some things we could do to better equip our students with essential skills and better assess how students are performing before they get to the thesis/dissertation stage. The graduate committee recently instituted a requirement that all students take at least one research seminar (as opposed to a readings seminar) as a regular part of their coursework before beginning the thesis or dissertation. Although such seminars were available in the past, not all students have taken them, and we could see a very distinct difference in the work of students who had completed a research seminar and students who hadn’t. An opportunity to exercise the skills associated with original research by writing an article-length piece in the structured environment of a weekly course clearly improved student outcomes. We felt this was an important intermediate step all students should attempt before undertaking a lengthy, long-term research project independently. The committee also concluded that there was some disparity in students’ skills at synthesizing secondary literature and integrating alternative arguments and/or theoretical viewpoints into their own writing. To address this, we are going to bring the issue to the attention of our graduate faculty and incorporate formal course-level assessment of these skills as students move through their coursework. In conducting our analysis, the graduate studies committee concluded that there were actually two important points in a graduate student’s career when it would be constructive to assess outcomes: 1) at the course level, when students are learning the basic skills they will deploy in the thesis or dissertation, and 2) at the thesis/dissertation level when they are applying these skills to an independent piece of research. We concluded that it would be useful to alternate assessment of learning outcomes between these two points. Since we evaluated theses and dissertations this year, next year we plan to focus our assessment at the graduate course level. The graduate studies committee will examine end-of-course writing and re-write the forms that professors use as end-of-course evaluations of individual students to include evaluation of skills associated with synthesis and integration of other arguments. These procedures will provide new data for our assessment of learning outcomes next year. This should also help us to stress essential skill-building at a critical, early stage in graduate training, and determine how effective course-level reforms are, and track progress among our graduates.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Hospitality Administration BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST
(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 pursuing 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
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
1.6 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
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. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
5. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
6. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4. External Relations
6. Undergraduate Experience
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
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. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
5. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity
6. Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6. 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. Global, cultural perspectives
2. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
3. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
4. 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
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 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
3 Oral Communication--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
3.2 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 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
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
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

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
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

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of the students taking the food safety course during 2006 - 2007 (62 students) successfully passed the food sanitation and safety course.

Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms
For all hospitality majors to pass this written test

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of the students taking the food safety course during 2006 - 2007 (62 students) successfully passed the food sanitation and safety course.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the “Above Expectations” to “Outstanding” category.
### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

### 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.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors (100%) received, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experiences. The School requires that all majors have a minimum of 575 work hours in the industry. At the conclusion of these hours, performance evaluations are completed by managers and supervisors and mailed directly to the School. Over 90% of the evaluations were in the "Above Expectations" to "Outstanding" category.

**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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.
The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The majority of students were successful in demonstrating the application of their knowledge and skills. This academic year provided many high-level course projects. For example, the Hospitality Service Marketing course worked with Burger King’s Corporate Office on two projects related to two new target markets for the restaurant chain. Numerous other course projects provided an opportunity for students to not only apply what they had learned in the classroom but to get industry feedback on project results.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

**Target for O4: Develop industry-specific specializations**
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O5: Application of human resource principles
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

Target for O10: Application of service marketing theories
The work portfolio must be completed at a satisfactory level to get credit for hours worked in the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of the hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2006-2007 academic year. The 4% who were not successful consisted of one person who dropped the course (to be taken later) and one who did not yet complete her work hours but will do so before graduation. The work study process has been refined to include meetings (individual and class) throughout the semester to discuss any work-related issues and learning opportunities.

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.

Target for O2: Understanding of ethical standards
For hospitality majors to show, at minimum, a satisfactory level (C or higher) of understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007.
Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Over 97% of hospitality majors achieved, at minimum, a "C" average in hospitality courses for the academic year 2006-2007. Hospitality faculty regularly review the content and format of tests for each course to ensure that major competencies are being properly evaluated.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All seniors completing the Senior Exit Exam in hospitality passed the test (minimum accepted score was 70.) This is a comprehensive exam encompassing all required hospitality courses.

**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
- Application of human resource principles
- Measure: HADM 4900 Work Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Application of human resource principles | Hospitality Work Experience
- Measure: Written performance evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
- Application of human resource principles | 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
- 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
- **Measure:** Written performance evaluations | **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: 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: All faculty
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 | Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms | Knowledge of strategic management principles
- **Measure:** HADM 4900 Work Portfolio | **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
- **Measure:** Senior Exit Exam | **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
- **Measure:** Written examinations | **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
- **Measure:** Written performance evaluations | **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

Environmental concerns/recommendations
All hospitality courses will include a section on environmental concerns and approaches to operating hospitality businesses in environmentally-aware ways.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Course projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Application of hospitality laws/regulations
Facilitate job search process
The School offers two career fairs annually (fall/spring). In addition, students are encouraged to participate in University and College career fairs/expos. Hospitality majors are encouraged, and will continue to be encouraged, to utilize Robinson COB Career Services for resume assistance and linkage to university networking.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Written performance evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Hospitality Work Experience

Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: All HADM faculty and administration

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments showed that a strong majority of students achieved the delineated competencies identified for each major course. In addition, assessments showed that a strong majority of students successfully applied their knowledge and skills in their industry-specific work experiences. Thirdly, through the senior exit exam, it was shown that students are retaining a significant portion of information covered throughout the required hospitality courses.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Senior Exit Exam currently covers information from required hospitality courses. The exam has not been expanded to include content from elective hospitality courses. Our goal for 2007-2008 is to expand the exam to be inclusive of all hospitality courses completed by majors.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
The School of Hospitality located in the Robinson College of Business experienced a 17.2% increase in credit hours during the academic year 2006-2007. The School, accredited by the Accreditation Commission of Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACHPA), went through the reaccreditation process in early 2007. The School simultaneously completed the Academic Program Review (APR) process. Both the reaccreditation and APR self-study processes included significant sections on assessment. In completing the self-study, the faculty as well as involved constituents met regularly over the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years. The School of Hospitality expanded course offerings at the undergraduate level, redesigned the MBA hospitality concentration and initiated several new industry partnerships as well as international exchanges. Regarding assessment, results showed that majors are graduating with a strong foundation in needed knowledge and skill competency areas. The knowledge and skills are being effectively applied in student internships and work experiences. From performance on the Senior Exit Exam and through alumni feedback, graduates leave the program with a strong foundation in competencies valued by the industry.

Contributions to the Institution
The School of Hospitality supported the University’s mission through research contributions, enhanced ties to the Atlanta community particularly through the hospitality industry, new facilities which will open fall 2007 and international connections through student exchanges and study abroad options. Ties to assessment processes exist for all of these hospitality program components.

Highlights
Highlights from 2006-2007 include the aviation program being moved from the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to the School of Hospitality in the Robinson College of Business. Three aviation courses were redesigned to be offered as hospitality electives with a focus on airline and airport management. The MBA hospitality concentration was revised to offer a focus on hotel real estate. Regarding assessment, highlighted accomplishments include 100% of majors successfully completing the foodservice safety and sanitation exam. Other highlights include very positive performance evaluations based on the student work experiences and internships. Graduating seniors taking the exit exam, based on content from required hospitality courses, also met the requirements of at least a 70% score.

Challenges
The School of Hospitality’s challenges maximizing our potential to grow in enrollment. The industry demand for students and graduates is extremely strong and is projected to increase. In addition to full-time faculty, the School utilizes the availability of part-time instructors (PTIs) to cover the needed number of course sections. The PTIs all have industry experience in additional to academic qualifications and make it possible to grow enrollment by adding additional courses and sections.

Teaching Activities
The School of Hospitality has worked to enhance learning for students by linking course material to applied “real life” business projects. Over 2006-2007, these have encompassed numerous projects. Examples include: 1. Hospitality Service Marketing: Working with Burger King Corporation to develop marketing strategies for newly identified target markets; 2. Food Production: The Atlanta Community Food Bank was the location for the food production course this past year. Projects included an end of the semester dinner which was prepared and served by students in the course. 3. Fairs, Festivals and Event Planning: This course included students developing the theme, planning and executing a city-wide event for hotel employees. 4. Tradeshow and Meeting Planning: Students developed a business plan for a proposed tradeshow encompassing budget, marketing materials and floor plan. Industry judges heard group presentations of these plans. Judges included tradeshow and venue experts from throughout the nation. 5. Hospitality Law - Students conducted inspections and audits of local hospitality businesses to evaluate potential liabilities. Progress was made on two new learning facilities with plans to open summer/fall 2007. These include the Hospitality Learning Center, the first dedicated hospitality classroom located in one of the nation’s top convention centers (Georgia World Congress Center), and the
Culinary Learning Center which will be the location of the food production course.

Research and Scholarly Activities
Hospitality faculty published in scholarly research journals as well as industry professional journals. In 2006-2007, full-time faculty averaged 3.6 articles including scholarly and professional publications. Since the hospitality faculty engage primarily in applied research with direct industry connections, research enhances teaching activities and supports student learning.

Public/Community Service
School of Hospitality faculty are active in University, College, departmental and professional community service. Examples of professional community service include representation in the following organizations: Atlanta Convention & Visitors Bureau; Georgia Hotel & Lodging Association; Georgia Restaurant Association; Club Managers Association of America - National & Georgia Chapter; Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education; Professional Convention Managers Association; National Automated Merchandising Association; Meeting Planners International; Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration. With the faculty’s strong engagement in industry service, these involvements help keep faculty up-to-date on current issues and trends with positive impact on classroom relevancy.

International Activities
The School of Hospitality conducts an annual Study Abroad trip during the Maymester. In addition, a formal exchange agreement was signed in April of 2006 with the Universite de Savoie in France. During spring 2007, a Savoie student attended Georgia State taking hospitality courses and a Georgia State hospitality major attended Savoie.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Human Resource Management MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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.

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.

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.

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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students were weak (average 2.3/5.0) in both class performance and SHRM certification examination items on issues concerning labor unions and employment law (especially OSHA and Sherman Act). 28% of graduates rated these areas a “needs improvement” or “not adequately covered.” Safety (under OSHA) was also cited by 11% of graduates as being inadequately covered in class.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

SHRM certification results indicated several students failed items on the Benefits portion of the exam. Faculty ratings of performance in class were 2.6/5.0. Student feedback indicated 11% felt benefits were inadequately covered.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Although those students who had taken MGS 8395 were pleased with the course and both faculty and clients rated the projects well (average 95/100), few HRM/MS students enroll in the course.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Faculty ratings of student performance averaged 2.7/5.0 and 17% of graduates felt recruiting and interviewing skills were inadequately covered in their classes. Part of the low performance may be a result of not having a full-time faculty member champion MGS 8360 in many years.

### 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

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

- **Measure:** Application of Concepts | **Outcome/Objective:** Application of Concepts
- **Measure:** Basic Principles | **Outcome/Objective:** Basic Principles
- **Measure:** Compensation Comprehension | **Outcome/Objective:** Compensation Comprehension
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking and Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking and Analysis

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None

#### Compensation

Include a required benefits module for students to complete in the project in MGS 8390(Compensation Management). Devote 3 additional hours of class time to covering benefits basics.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
Deficiencies in Legal Area
Incorporate 5 additional hours of class time to coverage of Sherman Act and OSHA and include more content in exams.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Improvement in MGS 8360 Concepts
Appoint an advocate (full-time faculty member) for MGS 8360 to ensure content areas are being covered thoroughly and accurately. Incorporate 3 additional hours of in-class experiential work in MGS 8360, especially in interviewing skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Low Enrollment in MGS 8395
Encourage more MS students to take the class. Form a committee to explore the possibility of making MGS 8395 a required course for all MS students.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
There were strong points on each of the topics that the HR MS program wishes to emphasize, however there was no area that was clearly a strength without need for improvement.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Each area showed needs for improvement. The breadth of acquisition of knowledge was a general concern, particularly in areas that have focused relevance to Human resource Management. In some cases elective classes that are thought to be important have low enrollments that may reflect students’ failure to appreciate the importance of the subject matter.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of the reviewed syllabi adequately reflected current practice in the field. However, on a curricular level faculty agreed that some new courses were called for.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of the reviewed syllabi adequately reflected current practice in the field. However, on a curricular level faculty agreed that some new courses were called for.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of the reviewed syllabi adequately reflected current practice in the field. However, on a curricular level faculty agreed that some new courses were called for.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of the reviewed syllabi adequately reflected current practice in the field. However, on a curricular level faculty agreed that some new courses were called for.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of the reviewed syllabi adequately reflected current practice in the field. However, on a curricular level faculty agreed that some new courses were called for.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of all students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of all students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of all students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of all students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of all students met or exceeded the standards.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the standards.

Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded the 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Instructional Systems Management | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**Implementation Description:** 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.

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

**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** All Faculty

**Additional Resources:** None

### Renumber IT 9050

We will renumber IT 9050 Evaluation to IT 8950 so that our M.S. students will be eligible to take it.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Instructional Systems Management | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Harmon

**Additional Resources:** None

### Continue to Monitor Admissions

We have recruited more students over the past year. We will need to continue to monitor admissions to ensure all students meet our standards.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Instructional Systems Management | Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**Implementation Description:**

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded the standards.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** S.W. Harmon

**Increase Number of Online Courses**  
Analysis of student preferences indicates we should increase the number of courses we offer online. We will add at least 6 new online courses this year.  
**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: End of Course Assessments  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Internship Report  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- 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  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  

**Responsible Person/Group:** S.W. Harmon

**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 2007-2008 academic year.  
**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: End of Course Assessments  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Internship Report  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- 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  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  

**Responsible Person/Group:** S.W. Harmon

**Revise Curriculum to Include Current Content**  
We will add three additional courses to the curriculum: IT 8500 Online Assessment and Evaluation IT 8420 Topics in Instructional Technology: Consulting IT 8420 Topics in Instructional Technology: Visual Literacy The latter two are on a trial basis.  
**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: End of Course Assessments  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  
- Measure: Internship Report  
- Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
- 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  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
- Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
- Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning  

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** S.W. Harmon

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**  
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?  
Our students consistently demonstrate a high level of competency across all standards. All students exhibited a high proficiency in their coursework, portfolios, and comprehensive exams.  
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Our students have consistently called for more online courses. In addition, the PSC has created a new endorsement in Online Teaching and Learning. To remain competitive we need to move more of our courses online. We have already created a new endorsement program and are awaiting final PSC approval. We will need to carefully develop and monitor these new online offerings to insure quality.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Instructional Technology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:03 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.

**Target for O2: Understands foundations of education**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.

**Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.

**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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.
### Target for O2: Understands foundations of education
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
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 ensure 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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.
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but recommended that three new courses be offered to reflect trends 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
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

**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
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Oral Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Residency Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty in the IT Ph.D. program.

**Additional Resources:** None

#### Create New Courses

We will add three additional courses to the curriculum: IT 8500 Online Assessment and Evaluation IT 8420 Topics in Instructional Technology: Consulting IT 8420 Topics in Instructional Technology: Visual Literacy The latter two are on a trial basis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty in Program

#### Enforce Cumulative Review

We instituted a cumulative review of Ph.D. students last year. However, not all students completed the review. This year we will place a hold on students’ registration until they have completed the review.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty in Program

#### Monitor Standards

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

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

- **Measure:** Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Oral Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **Measure:** Residency Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty in the IT Ph.D. program.

**Additional Resources:** None
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education
- Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship | Understands foundations of education
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education
- Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology
- Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship | Understands foundations of education

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty in Program

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
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?
Although we instituted an annual review, not all students undertook it. We did not enforce the requirement sufficiently. As a result, those students who most needed the review as a prompt to keep making progress in their programs, tended to be the ones who did not participate in the process. We will enforce a mandatory review this year by holding registration until students have completed the review.
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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 (M: 2)
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
We have aligned projects in the relevant courses with our objectives. All students passed the courses. The students also passed the projects in question which evaluated overall understanding.

#### M 2: Internship supervisor and student survey (O: 2, 6)
While students are on their functionally-based internship, we will survey the students and their internship supervisor for functionally proficiency.

**Target for O2: Extend Functional Skills**
Students should pass the internship portion. All students to date have passed.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students completed a survey regarding their internship experience. All students described improvement in their functional proficiency. In addition, all internship supervisors were individually surveyed for student performance in the functional area of the internship. All field supervisors described the students’ performances as acceptable or better.

**Target for O6: Extended Work Experience**
Students should pass the internship portion. All students to date have passed.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students successfully completed at least one of the three acceptable evaluations for language proficiency.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
This survey is still being administered. The students who took the survey before the cornerstone are now eligible to take the capstone. Findings will, therefore, be updated as they become available.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Approximately 20 students engaged in the capstone project in question. Students all self-assessed and team-assessed a passing score. Faculty assessment also resulted in a passing score with an average score of A-.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Approximately 10 internship supervisors were asked to respond to a survey of student interns performance of the internship. All supervisors reported student performance at acceptable levels or higher.

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

**Develop survey**

- **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**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and IB 8090 faculty

**Projects**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and Ilgaz Arian

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Journalism BA**

*(As of: 12/13/2016 03:03 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
7. Critical Thinking--major

**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, 2)
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

<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>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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: contemporary issues (M: 1, 2)
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

<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>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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: technology (M: 1)
Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC, BEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 5: critical and ethical communication (M: 1)
Students will be critical and ethical communicators and consumers of communication.

Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

<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>1.3 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>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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 6: Industry contexts (M: 1, 2)
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
- 9 Contemporary Issues—major
- 13 Technology—major

### 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

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The average assigned grade for a sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was 77.8%. The average grade based on an eight-item rubric for a sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 73.6%. 
**M 2: exam scores (O: 2, 3, 6)**
Answers to ten questions on exams in Jour 3060, Mass Communication Law and Policy.

**Target for O2: critical thinking**
An average of 70 (out of 100) or better on the answers to ten exam questions.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average score for ten exam questions in Jour 3060 was 77%.

**Target for O3: contemporary issues**
An average of 70 (out of 100) or better on the answers to ten exam questions.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average score for ten exam questions in Jour 3060 was 77%.

**Target for O6: Industry contexts**
An average of 70 (out of 100) or better on the answers to ten exam questions.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The average score for ten exam questions in Jour 3060 was 77%.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>action plan</th>
<th>established in cycle</th>
<th>implementation status</th>
<th>priority</th>
<th>relationships (measure</th>
<th>outcome/objective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>additional measures</strong></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>research papers</td>
<td>contemporary issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation description</td>
<td>Fall semester 06</td>
<td><strong>responsible person/group</strong></td>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>action plan</th>
<th>established in cycle</th>
<th>implementation status</th>
<th>priority</th>
<th>relationships (measure</th>
<th>outcome/objective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>goal revision</strong></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>research papers</td>
<td>contemporary issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation description</td>
<td>January 07</td>
<td><strong>responsible person/group</strong></td>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional resources</td>
<td>Review of peer and aspirational schools’ curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>action plan</th>
<th>established in cycle</th>
<th>implementation status</th>
<th>priority</th>
<th>relationships (measure</th>
<th>outcome/objective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>measure revision</strong></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>research papers</td>
<td>contemporary issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation description</td>
<td>Fall semester 06</td>
<td><strong>responsible person/group</strong></td>
<td>Journalism and Mass Communication faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>action plan</th>
<th>established in cycle</th>
<th>implementation status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum revision</strong></td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

The Journalism curriculum is currently undergoing a significant revision that will result in better measures to assess student performance. The current courses used for assessment, Communication Law and Regulation, Jour 3060, and Introduction to Mass Communication Theories, Jour 3070, are the core courses for all three concentrations of study. Assessment of the revised curriculum will emphasize writing. Two courses have been added for all Journalism majors: one is a basic writing course taken at the 3000-level and the other is a capstone course requiring a major research report. The additional courses will allow for multiple assessment measures of each curricular outcome/objective.
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: exam scores | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
- | critical thinking | Industry contexts
- Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
- | critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication

**Implementation Description:** Fall 07

**Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The assessment findings show that most Journalism students are achieving at least 70% on exams and research papers in the two core courses. These findings are similar to the previous years' findings even though the measures were modestly changed from year to year. The evidence would seem to indicate that curricular outcomes/objectives are being consistently met, and therefore, the status quo should be maintained. But the Journalism faculty are not satisfied with many curricular issues, including assessment and student performance. The primary concern is that the curriculum is not keeping pace with the dynamics of a digital revolution roiling mass communication industries. The faculty agree that the curricular objectives/outcomes are adequate but that the curricular structure is not appropriate to prepare undergraduates to compete in their career fields. Progress has been made in a significant curricular revision and how the new curriculum should be assessed.

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

The ongoing discussions involving curricular revision are emphasizing researching and writing. For example, a new capstone course would require the student to research and write a lengthy (minimum 20 pages) report on an ethical dilemma faced by a professional journalist/PR practitioner. This course would allow multiple measures of most curricular outcomes/objectives. Revision of the outcomes/objectives were not seen by the faculty as necessary; rather, the faculty are currently considering how best to achieve the same outcomes/objectives in a different curricular structure. Once the revision of the curriculum is completed, the faculty may reconsider altering the outcomes/objectives.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

2006-2007 Law

_Asc of: 12/12/2016 03:03 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, writing workshops, and clinical education. We seek to produce students whose knowledge, performance and behavior exemplify the best of the legal profession. We encourage students to engage in significant pro bono activities related to skills they develop in the College of Law. As of Spring 2007, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. In the academic year 2006-07, beginning with Summer 2006 and ending in Spring 2007, 212 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Ten of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows. JD/MPA - 2; JD/MBA - 7; JD/MPA - 2; Other -1.

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

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)**

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
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 Lefkowitz 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-Niagara 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 Moot Court 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 Lefkowitz 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).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

We continue to have one of the strongest advocacy (trial and appellate) programs in the region. Student satisfaction, participation and success are all quite good.

M 2: Annual Assessment of Externship Program (O: 1, 2)

The College of Law places its 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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Students, faculty and supervisors continue to rate our externship program as excellent. The only aspect of it that is less than satisfactory is that we are unable to offer the part-time students the full range of externship opportunities available to full-time students. We will continue to explore alternative placements to remedy that.
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 externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing adjustment and with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students, faculty and supervisors continue to rate our externship program as excellent. The only aspect of it that is less than satisfactory is that we are unable to offer the part-time students the full range of externship opportunities available to full-time students. We will continue to explore alternative placements to remedy that.

M 3: 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

We aspire to have our students pass the July bar exam at or above the national rate for July first-time takers (75%). Our students have beaten this mark significantly and repeatedly. Since 1990, our first-time takers’ July passage rate (the most significant indicator of typical performance) has dipped below 94% only twice. In July 2006, 93% of our first-time takers passed. This passage rate compares quite favorably with both the University of Georgia and Emory Law Schools; every year, these three schools garner the best passage rates in the state, often trading first, second and third place.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Since 1990, our first-time takers’ July passage rate (the most significant indicator of typical performance) has dipped below 94% only twice. In July 2006, 93% of our first-time takers passed. This passage rate compares quite favorably with both the University of Georgia and Emory Law Schools; every year, these three schools garner the best passage rates in the state, often trading first, second and third place.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

We aspire to have our students pass the July bar exam at or above the national rate for July first-time takers (75%). Our students have beaten this mark significantly and repeatedly. Since 1990, our first-time takers’ July passage rate (the most significant indicator of typical performance) has dipped below 94% only twice. In July 2006, 93% of our first-time takers passed. This passage rate compares quite favorably with both the University of Georgia and Emory Law Schools; every year, these three schools garner the best passage rates in the state, often trading first, second and third place.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Since 1990, our first-time takers’ July passage rate (the most significant indicator of typical performance) has dipped below 94% only twice. In July 2006, 93% of our first-time takers passed. This passage rate compares quite favorably with both the University of Georgia and Emory Law Schools; every year, these three schools garner the best passage rates in the state, often trading first, second and third place.

M 4: 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

Unlike the bar exam, the results of the MPRE are not reported directly to the College. Even so, graduates may not be admitted to the Bar without having passed both the bar exam and the MPRE. Indeed, the vast majority of our students take and pass the MPRE on their first try well in advance of taking the bar exam, often before graduation from the College. To date, we have not had a single student whose admission to the bar was denied or significantly delayed for poor performance on the MPRE.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

To date, we have not had a single student whose admission to the bar was denied or significantly delayed for poor performance on the MPRE.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Unlike the bar exam, the results of the MPRE are not reported directly to the College. Even so, graduates may not be admitted to the Bar without having passed both the bar exam and the MPRE. Indeed, the vast majority of our students take and pass the MPRE on their first try well in advance of taking the bar exam, often before graduation from the College. To date, we have not had a single student whose admission to the bar was denied or significantly delayed for poor performance on the MPRE.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

To date, we have not had a single student whose admission to the bar was denied or significantly delayed for poor performance on the MPRE.

M 5: 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 2006, we had 181 graduates. Of those 181, 177 responded to our survey regarding their employment status. Of the 167 seeking legal employment, 163 (97.6%) were so employed. 84.05% were employed full time legal, 12.27% were employed full time non-legal, and 3.68% were employed part-time legal. 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 many other law firms of note. A number of Georgia State College of Law graduates serve as senior or 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 Speaker of the House of the Georgia General Assembly is a College of Law graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Our 6-month legal employment numbers continue to be outstanding. In a further effort to improve our Career Services Office, however, we commissioned an independent audit of the office in 2007. The results of that audit are now in, and we are (as of June 2007) in the process of reviewing and making the necessary changes.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

In 2006, we had 181 graduates. Of those 181, 177 responded to our survey regarding their employment status. Of the 167 seeking legal employment, 163 (97.6%) were so employed. 84.05% were employed full time legal, 12.27% were employed full time non-legal, and 3.68% were employed part-time legal. 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 many other law firms of note. A number of Georgia State College of Law graduates serve as senior or 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 Speaker of the House of the Georgia General Assembly is a College of Law graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Our 6-month legal employment numbers continue to be outstanding. In a further effort to improve our Career Services Office, however, we commissioned an independent audit of the office in 2007. The results of that audit are now in, and we are (as of June 2007) in the process of reviewing and making the necessary changes.

M 6: Attracting applicants with excellent credentials (O: 1, 2)

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 median LSAT for 2006 was 160. 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. The median GPA for 2006 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

We seek to attract the best potential students from the local, regional and national market. The best measure of our success is the comparability of our entering class’ credentials with those of our nearest and most natural competitors, both in geography and national rank.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

For 2007-2008, the national trend of fewer law school applications can be seen at GSU. Even so, we have been able to maintain our mean LSAT and GPA at nearly the identical level to that from 2006-2007.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

We seek to attract the best potential students from the local, regional and national market. The best measure of our success is the comparability of our entering class’ credentials with those of our nearest and most natural competitors, both in geography and national rank.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

For 2007-2008, the national trend of fewer law school applications can be seen at GSU. Even so, we have been able to maintain our mean LSAT and GPA at nearly the identical level to that from 2006-2007.

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
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.

Assess Summer Skills Program

Assess Effectiveness of the Legal Writing Program

In 2005-06, we surveyed second and third year students to determine their views on the effectiveness of RWA in preparing them for employment. Overall, students were very confident in their writing and oral advocacy skills. Additionally, in assessing how they felt their research and writing skills compared to students from other schools, a majority of students reported their skills were stronger; only 7% reported their skills were weaker. Most students reported that their RWA professor had "somewhat higher" standards than their summer supervisors. In response to a question on how our program could be revised to train them more effectively, students suggested writing shorter memos, having more opportunities for oral presentations, and allocating more credits to RWA. The RWA faculty and the faculty curriculum committee will follow-up on these student suggestions as part of a faculty review of the RWA curriculum.

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.

Assess Effectiveness of the Legal Writing Program

In 2006-2007, we compared the yearly GPA's of those program invitees who attended with those of the invitees who did not attend, to see if there was any substantial difference. To date, the findings are inconclusive. Even so, the Director of the Program reports that she more carefully monitors continuing success of her program.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Library Media Technology MLM
As of 12/12/2016 03:04 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: 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 2: 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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
# 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All candidates met this 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 8.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All candidates met this 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All candidates met this 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):
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
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.

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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

Additional Resources: Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-2008 academic year.

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 2007-2008 academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
Responsible Person/Group: LMT 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 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Responsible Person/Group: LMT 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 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.
Responsible Person/Group: LMT 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 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning.
Responsible Person/Group: LMT 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 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies.
Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
All candidates were successful in meeting the objectives. The program is rigorous and well-aligned with national (AASL) and Georgia (GAPSC) standards, and students continue to perform at a high level.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
At this time the data reveal no particular outcomes that require special attention, as all are fully met.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Managerial Science BBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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.

### Strategic Plan Associations

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

On the fall 2006 ETS Exam graduating seniors majoring in Managerial Sciences placed in the 85th percentile as a group against a 65th percentile performance for all students, including MGS students. On the spring 2007 ETS Exam graduating seniors majoring in Managerial Sciences placed in the 90th percentile against a 75th percentile performance by RCB students as a whole. These two administrations of the ETS Business Test were different versions.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

On the fall 2006 ETS Exam graduating seniors majoring in Managerial Sciences placed in the 85th percentile as a group. On the spring 2007 ETS Exam graduating seniors majoring in Managerial Sciences placed in the 90th percentile as a group. These two administrations of the ETS Business Test were different versions.

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

#### Development of Levels of Skills

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.

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

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

- Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools
- Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
- Measure: MGS 4000 Performance Relative to other RCB Students
- Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006

**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.

#### Continual Improvement in major courses

Managerial Sciences needs to focus on improving the rigor of the instruction in the courses taken by its majors. This needs to include reinforcement of the basic concepts of management that are taught in the MGS 3400 course. The primary venue for this will be MGS 4000, the only required course for the department’s very diverse student population.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools
- Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
- Measure: MGS 4000 Performance Relative to other RCB Students
- Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Managerial Sciences Faculty Members
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The results did show that Managerial Science students do significantly outperform students of the RCB in general and the broader national pool of students taking the ETS Business Exam.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While students did perform well, the bias toward Management questions among the MGS seniors should have produced a positioning in the 95th percentile, the highest that ETS reports. In the spring 2007 administration of the test RCB students in Accounting, Finance and Computer Information Systems all performed in the 95th percentile on questions in their area.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Marketing BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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
7 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

M 1: Identify actual marketing problems (O: 1)
Demonstrate the ability to identify important issues and problems faced by marketing organizations.

Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
4.0/7.0

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5.275/7.0

M 2: Explore Alternative Marketing Solutions (O: 1)
Students will be able to identify alternative solutions and enumerate pros and cons of each solution proposed

**Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.625/7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Evaluate pros and cons of alternative solutions (O: 1)**

Students will be able to explore the pros and cons of alternative proposed marketing solutions

**Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.675/7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Apply quantitative and qualitative data (O: 1)**

Students will be able to use appropriate and relevant quantitative and qualitative data in the analysis of marketing problems.

**Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Develop appropriate recommendations (O: 1)**

Students will be able to develop recommendations to marketing problems that offer a coherent decision

**Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.875/7.0</td>
<td></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

**Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.475/7.0</td>
<td></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.

**Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
<td></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.

**Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0/7.0</td>
<td></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.
### 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 5.4/7.0 |

### M 11: 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 5.0/7.0 |

### M 12: 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 action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 6.2/7.0 |

### M 13: 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 6.6/7.0 |

### M 14: 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 5.8/7.0 |

### M 15: 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: Met

| 5.2/7.0 |

### M 16: 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0/7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
6.4/7.0

M 17: 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)

Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning
4.0/7.0

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5.4/7.0

M 18: 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 to a marketing organization’s needs and goals.

Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning
4.0/7.0

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
6.4/7.0

M 19: Demonstrate sound financial planning (O: 2)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the relationship between marketing decision making and sound financial principles.

Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning
4.0/7.0

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
6.0/7.0

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 pro 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: 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

Improved Situation Analysis
Encourage faculty to address the elements of a good situation analysis through lecture/discussion and assignments in appropriate courses (e.g. Buyer Behavior, Advertising, Advertising Campaigns).

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Increase emphasis on critical thinking
Encourage faculty in undergraduate courses to increase their usage of critical thinking exercises, especially with respect to (M2) Exploring Alternative Marketing Solutions, (M3) Evaluating Pros and Cons of Alternative Solutions, (M4) Applying Qualitative and Quantitative Data and (M6) Supporting Decisions With Data

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Support decisions with data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
First, it should be noted that we changed our measurement instrument from a 5 point scale to a 7 point scale. We did this in order to provide a greater level of sensitivity for raters. Therefore, for between-year comparisons we converted the averages ratings to percentages by dividing the actual mean score by the top score possible. Thus a 4.0 on the 05-06 would equate to 80%. Using this system, we have seen improvement in 13 of our criterion measures. All six measures relating to Objective #1 have improved by ten or more percentage points. We should note that some of this improvement might be related to our own improved skills at assessing how well students achieve desired outcomes. That is, our Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, which conducts the assessment process, has learned through its own experience with the process to sharpen its approach to objective setting and to become more attuned to detecting evidence of success (or lack of success) at achieving desired outcomes. On the other hand, it should also be noted that some of our faculty have increased their use of exercises and problems intended to provide more practice in marketing problem analysis. For example, subsequent to past results, one committee member, who teaches some of our undergraduate Buyer Behavior classes, added assignments to those classes specifically aimed at developing students’ skills in such areas as critical thinking, data analysis and application of basic “marketing arithmetic.”

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In two areas, especially, we can see that more effort is needed. Specifically, M7: Develop a Situation Analysis and M15: Apply the 4P’s to Marketing Planning. With respect to the former, it may be that the assignment used to assess Objective #2, did not require a formal Situation Analysis. Because this assignment is a project executed on behalf of a Marketing Organization, the “situation analysis” is, perhaps, a given, with little need for the students to develop their own. Nevertheless, we need to ensure that this outcome is specifically addressed through at least one major assignment in our capstone course and assignments, where appropriate in required and elective courses. With respect to the latter measure (M15), the drop of 3 points cold be the result of sampling error, but we will address this measure in more depth to determine if we need to make instructional improvements, measurement improvements or both.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.78, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.43, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.43, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 4.00, 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 requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 4.11, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.70, exceeding both the basic requirement and 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.60, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.60, exceeding both the basic requirement and 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.89, exceeding both the basic requirement and 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.89, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.11, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.11, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.22, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.44, exceeding the basic requirement.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.89, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.67, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal.

**M 18: Differences between domestic and intl environments (O: 3)**
Student(s) identified differences between domestic and international marketing environments

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.50, exceeding the basic requirement and meeting the goal.

**M 19: Differences between domestic and intl processes (O: 3)**
Student(s) identified differences between domestic and international marketing processes

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

Communication of Assessment Results
Provide each faculty member, who provided student materials to be assessed, with the results of that assessment. We will also provide a comparison of the 2005/2006 results with the 2006/2007 results.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

As our experience with assessment accumulates, those involved have started to provide suggestions for improving the reliability of the ratings provided. The following suggestions will be explored: (1) Provide assessors with the description of the project being evaluated (provided by the faculty teaching that specific course.) (2) Hold a meeting of the assessors to discuss evaluation guidelines. (3) Solicit feedback from the assessors relative to improving the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Increased Faculty Involvement
1. Encourage feedback from the faculty whose students' materials have been evaluated, relative to the assessment results. 2. Establish an on-going evaluation of the assessment process, including the assessment instruments and the materials assessed. 3. Develop an on-going dialogue related to improving student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Increased Faculty Involvement
1. Encourage feedback from the faculty whose students' materials have been evaluated, relative to the assessment results. 2. Establish an on-going evaluation of the assessment process, including the assessment instruments and the materials assessed. 3. Develop an on-going dialogue related to improving student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

Increased Faculty Involvement
1. Encourage feedback from the faculty whose students' materials have been evaluated, relative to the assessment results. 2. Establish an on-going evaluation of the assessment process, including the assessment instruments and the materials assessed. 3. Develop an on-going dialogue related to improving student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Assess Change in a Dynamic Environment | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Attention to Customer Satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Changes Targeted at Customers' Wants/Needs | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Conclusions Consistent with Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research
- Measure: Differences between domestic and int'l environments | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Differences between domestic and int'l processes | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Identification of Relevant Rights at Issue | Outcome/Objective: Recognize and discuss ethical issues
- Measure: Identify Necessary Information | Outcome/Objective: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research
- Measure: Identify Relevant Stakeholders and Consequences | Outcome/Objective: Recognize and discuss ethical issues
- Measure: Identify Sources of Competitive Advantage | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Proposal of Alternative Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Recognize and discuss ethical issues
- Measure: Proposal of Alternative Implementation Plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Solution Consistent with Abilities/Objectives | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Use of Appropriate Marketing Information | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Use of Appropriate Statistical Tools | Outcome/Objective: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research
- Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)
Pedagogical Changes
Discuss with individual faculty potential pedagogical changes at the course level, aimed at enhancing higher-level learning outcomes, such as critical thinking skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Assess Change in a Dynamic Environment | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Identify Sources of Competitive Advantage | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Realistic Implementation Plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

Scholarship-Sharing Series
Sponsor an S-Cubed session focusing on best practices within the department relative to enhancing student learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
As of our experience with assessment increases, we are thinking through some of the challenges of our specific situation. We are assessing learning outcomes for our MS in Marketing students. This is a relatively small program, with our students taking classes with the flexible MBA students. There are several challenges in making definitive statements concerning student learning outcomes.

(1) The assessment will often be based on a very small sample size. (2) Often, the assessor will be evaluating a group project. A given team may have only one MS student, whose work will therefore be confounded with that of the other team members. Our students continue to demonstrate competence on the majority of the performance objectives measured. 65% 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 41% of the mean scores, compared with the 2005/2006 report, showed improvement. About 47% dipped and 12% showed no change. Finally, the learning objective scores for the 2006/2007 assessment compare favorably with the same scores for the 2005/2006 assessment. Scores were a little higher on four outcomes (3.6 to 3.9 on ability to fashion marketing solutions; 3.96 to 4.06 on analyze and interpret relevant information; 3.4 to 3.50 on collect, analyze and interpret marketing research; and 3.11 to 3.15 on recognize and discuss ethical issues. Identify marketing problems and opportunities dipped from 3.75 to 3.67; and demonstrate a customer/client orientation held steady at 3.70. For this assessment cycle, we have also expanded the scope of materials assessed. We added materials from two additional graduate classes - MK 8100: Buyer Behavior and MK 8600: International Marketing. This also generated three additional measures.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
As noted above and in our action items, our immediate focus reflects the need to better communicate the results of the assessment process to faculty members, increase faculty involvement and input, and to improve inter-rater reliability. We view these items as "intermediary" steps designed to improve both the reliability and validity of the results of our assessment activities. Certainly we will bring low assessments to the attention of the faculty involved, but we also want to improve the quality of those assessments.
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)**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Organizations 1 (O: 1)**

Students will be able to describe historical development of public administration thought in America.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In the previous academic year, 66 percent of students fully demonstrated the ability to describe the historical development of public administration thought in America. Less than one third (30 percent) of students partially demonstrated such skill, while just four percent did not master this skill.

**M 2: 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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Seventy-seven percent of students indicate this skill as fully demonstrated in the last academic year. About one fifth or 21 percent of students partially demonstrated this skill and only two percent of students did not master this skill.

**M 3: Organizations 3 (O: 1)**

Students will be able to identify major ethical issues that arise in public service.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In the last academic year, three quarters or 75 percent of students fully demonstrate this skill. Twenty-four percent of students partially demonstrate the ability to identify major ethical issues that arise in public service. Just two percent of students were not able to demonstrate this skill.

**M 4: 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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Well over half of students (63 percent) fully demonstrated this skill in the previous academic year, while 37 percent partially demonstrated this skill. We did not have any students who were not able to at least partially demonstrate an understanding of the basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and related fields.
### M 5: Research Methods & Statistics 2 (O: 1)
Students will be able to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
In the previous academic year, three quarters or 75 percent of students fully demonstrated this skill. Fifteen percent of students partially demonstrated this skill, while ten percent of students were not able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics for testing and describe results correctly.

### M 6: 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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
In the previous academic year, 78 percent of students fully demonstrated this skill; 22 percent of students partially demonstrated this skill. We had no students unable to at least partially demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression analysis.

### M 7: Microeconomics 1 (O: 1)
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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
In the previous academic year, two thirds of students (66 percent) fully demonstrated this skill. Twenty-five percent of students partially demonstrated this skill while just nine percent of students were unable to demonstrate the ability to describe the basic tools of government intervention in the economy.

### M 8: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 (O: 1)
Students will be able to describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets and budget making in America.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Most students (90 percent) fully demonstrate this skill in the previous academic year. Eight percent of students partially demonstrate this skill, while just two percent of students were not able to demonstrate the ability to describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets and budget making in America.

### M 9: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 (O: 1)
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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
In the previous academic year, 86 percent of students fully demonstrate this skill. Twelve percent of students partially demonstrate this skill, and just two percent of students were not able to demonstrate the ability 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.

### M 10: 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
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Microeconomics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Microeconomics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

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
MPA faculty discussions on Organizations courses

Faculty are engaging in discussions about learning objectives related to our core courses on organizations: PAUS 8111 and PAUS 8171. Core faculty are revisiting outcomes and objectives for those courses and considering potential overlap.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Microeconomics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

Implementation Description: Ongoing; should complete by December 2007
Responsible Person/Group: John Thomas

MPA Committee

Committee of MPA faculty to evaluate the MPA curriculum. Will examine and assess WEAVE report findings to refine curriculum as necessary. The MPA committee will also consider areas for targeted improvement in student outcomes, such as quantitative skill development.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Microeconomics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

Implementation Description: January 2008
Responsible Person/Group: John Thomas

Accreditation Self-Study

The MPA program is undergoing professional reaccreditation through the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. The MPA faculty are preparing an extensive self-study report as part of that process, and analysis of learning objectives is a key component.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Microeconomics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Organizations 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Public Management 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

Implementation Description: March 30, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: All PAUS faculty
**MPA Faculty Teaching Research Methods**

These faculty will meet to discuss emphasis on various topics and advancing uniformity of course content in PAUS 8121 and 8131. Faculty will discuss how to improve learning outcomes for students who enter the program with subpar quantitative skills.

*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- Measure: Research Methods & Statistics 3 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements

**Implementation Description:** January 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Gregory Lewis

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Average percentages of core MPA learning outcomes assessments indicate that 74 percent of students can fully demonstrate the skills measured, 23 percent of students partially demonstrate such skills and just three percent of students are unable to demonstrate the skills of interest. Clearly, most of our students are achieving the desired outcomes of this academic program, on most dimensions. Our strength is in providing students with substantive understanding of the foundations of public management and organization theory as well as exposure to the strategies necessary for effective public and nonprofit management in a modern age. We anticipate further supporting such outcomes with ongoing reflection about our core through curriculum redevelopment. Specifically, the current work of the MPA Committee is generating a better stream of related assignments throughout the MPA core that will strengthen the focus of assignments to critical thinking and analytical skill development.

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

Our core MPA learning outcomes assessments indicate the greatest weaknesses in student learning in our statistics courses (specifically related to student understanding of research design methods) and the microeconomics course. Part of this weaker performance in our students can be attributed to the deficiencies of our students’ undergraduate math preparation that would impact performance in these more quantitative courses. Also, these courses are some of the first courses that students take upon enrollment in the MPA program. Still, we believe that such weakness warrants continued attention. We will address this issue in three specific ways over the next academic year. First, we have asked faculty who teach courses in research methods to consider curricular and learning issues specific to those courses. Since those are two of the first and most quantitatively oriented courses that students take, we expect that those faculty will be in the best position to make recommendations. Second, our MPA Committee will consider quantitative learning outcomes and how they are best addressed by our curriculum. That committee will determine where quantitative skills should appear in certain courses and whether prerequisites may be needed. Third, our entire faculty will participate in our NASPAA accreditation process, which involves a self-report and site visit by external reviewers. The formulation of the self-report and interaction with external reviewers will help to shed light on the best means of addressing these specific deficiencies in student learning outcomes.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Executive Summary**

MPA faculty have been active in evaluating progress and working to achieve goals. MPA faculty have contributed substantially to university-wide initiatives and engaged in public service projects with a number of organizations. MPA faculty have continued assessment of learning outcomes and means for increasing student enrollment. MPA faculty have been engaged in a wide range of research projects, resulting in a number of articles and books published during 2006.

**Contributions to the Institution**

The MPA program continues to support Georgia State University’s role as a leader in public service education. Faculty serve on a number of key university committees, including the Faculty Advisory Board for the Georgia State Career Services Program, Charitable Contributions Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee for the Career Development Center, Study Abroad Study Faculty Review Committee, Faculty Senate, and Hearing Panel.

**Highlights**

The Department has supported the graduate student-run organization, the PAUS Network, and a revitalization of the PAUS Alumni Club. Both of these organizations sponsored events during 2006. In the fall of 2006, the Department published the second issue of the PAUS Informer, which promoted department and college events and provided new students with additional information about our academic programs. The Department continued a series of regular lunch hour seminars. Three were offered during spring and fall 2006; one focused on leadership strategies, one was a career fair, and one was on education policy. PAUS added two new study abroad opportunities to the existing program in 2006.

**Challenges**

The MPA program is challenged by a difficult market for students. Wide availability of professional positions in the Atlanta area has led many students to work full-time instead of pursuing graduate studies, which has resulted in challenges for keeping enrollments robust. We are working as a faculty to identify opportunities for growth and ways to innovatively meet our enrollment challenges.

**Teaching Activities**

Our dedication to professional education was illustrated by over 50 MPA students registering for and/or completing internships in 2006. Our students conduct internships in a wide variety of federal, state and local government agencies, as well as with universities and schools, in not-for-profit organizations and for private businesses. Faculty continued conversation about the MPA curriculum and is in the process of determining which courses should be included in the core and which should be included as electives. Analyses of curricula in other highly respected MPA programs were conducted in order to compare our approach to national norms.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**

During 2006, 281 scholarly papers, chapters and books were published or forthcoming by faculty in the Andrew Young School of
Policy Studies. Another 117 papers are presently under review and in the revision process. It is also heartening to note that 35% percent of the published or accepted papers in 2006 were joint products of two or more of our faculty or research associates. This research appears in some of the most highly respected journals in public administration, public policy, and economics. A complete list of articles and books published by MPA faculty during 2006 can be accessed at http://aysps.gsu.edu/ar2006/faculty/papers.htm.

Public/Community Service

MPA faculty are involved in technical training, technical assistance, and applied research projects for a number of government and non-profit organizations. Client organizations include agencies at the local, state, and federal levels. MPA faculty are involved in community service through the applied research centers in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, including the Non-Profit Studies Program, the Public Performance and Management Group, the Fiscal Research Center, and the Georgia Health Policy Center. A full list of projects can be accessed at http://aysps.gsu.edu/ar2006/externalfunding/index.htm.

International Activities

The PAUS department created a study-abroad student exchange program for students at The University of Northumbria's (UNN) School of Arts and Social Sciences, located in Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K. In addition to the PAUS department's collaboration with the University of Northumbria (UNN), a second study abroad exchange program available to graduate students was created through a joint effort with the Institut de Hautes Études en Administration Publique (IDHEAP) at the University of Lausanne. The PAUS department has partnered with Schiller International University to provide both undergraduate and graduate students with an opportunity to study the policies, the procedures, and the general nature of the European Union. The program titled, “The European Union: International Relationships, Cultural Diversity, and Environmental Policy” is an intensive 21-day study abroad program and based in the cities of Strasbourg and Paris, France. Thanks to ties with Schiller International University, the Andrew Young School was able to host a guest lecture by Harald Leibrecht, a distinguished member of the German Bundestag active in both the EU and UN. Mr. Leibrecht's lecture generated a great deal of interest among the University community and was well attended.

---
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Mission / Purpose

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. 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Apply techniques to solving applied problems (M: 1, 2, 3)

The ability to solve applied problems using mathematics demands solid understanding of related mathematics subjects and various other skills needed to apply mathematics effectively.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
7 Critical Thinking--major
8 Critical Thinking--core
9 Contemporary Issues--major
10 Contemporary Issues--core
11 Quantitative Skills--major
12 Quantitative Skills--core
13 Technology--major
14 Technology--core

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs (M: 2, 3)

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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication--major
2 Written Communication--core
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 4: Written communication (M: 2, 3, 5)
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 5: Critical thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)
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 6: Quantitative skills (M: 2, 3)
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 7: Contemporary issues (M: 2, 3, 5)
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 8: Technology (M: 2, 3, 5)
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

**SLO 9: Quantitative Literacy - Core (M: 4)**

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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

12 Quantitative Skills--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: 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

**O/O 10: Technology - Core**

Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Written Communication--core
12 Quantitative Skills--core
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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Quantitative Literacy Quizzes (O: 2, 5)**

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 O2: Apply techniques to solving applied problems**

Quizzes are administered to 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students. An overall 70% "Success Rate" is the target. A 50% Response rate is the target.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

While in most cases students aren't reaching the targeted “success rate” of 70% on these QL quizzes, we definitely have seen improvement in performance from the Pre- to the Post- in three out of the four classes. The Response Rate of 50% was met. Fall 2006 Pre-QL Post-QL 1101 1111 1113 2211 1101 1111 1113 2211 Total # Takers 336 434 384 252 387 351 314 153 Response Rate 34.1 78.9 80.7 41.1 45.9 74.7 74.6 56.9 Average # Correct 3.18 3.53 3.60 4.13 2.7 4.09 4.74 4.17 % out of 100 45.43 50.43 51.43 59.00 38.57 58.43 67.71 59.57 Spring 2007 Pre-QL Post-QL 1101 1111 1113 2211 1101 1111 1113 2211 Total # Takers 435 186 255 203 323 127 171 130 Response Rate 59.67 62.84 65.38 61.52 52.35 52.48 52.29 67.36 Average # Correct 3.17 4.28 4.91 4.26 2.81 4.35 5.13 4.56 % out of 100 45.25 61.10 70.10 60.80 40.13 62.15 73.24 65.16 Full Report for MATH 1070 Report for MATH 1101 Report for MATH 1111 Report for MATH 1113 Report for MATH 2211
**Target for O5: Critical thinking**

Quizzes are administered to 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students. An overall 70% "Success Rate" is the target. A 50% Response rate is the target.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

While in most cases students aren't reaching the targeted “success rate” of 70% on these QL quizzes, we definitely have seen improvement in performance from the Pre- to the Post- in three out of the four classes. The Response Rate of 50% was met.

Fall 2006 Pre-QL Post-QL 1101 1111 1113 2211 1101 1111 1113 2211 Total # Takers 336 434 384 252 387 351 314 153 Response Rate 34.1 78.9 60.7 41.1 45.9 74.7 74.6 56.9 Average # Correct 3.17 4.28 4.91 4.26 2.81 4.35 5.13 4.56 % out of 100 45.43 50.43 51.43 59.00 38.57 58.43 67.71 59.57 Spring 2007 Pre-QL Post-QL 1101 1111 1113 2211 1101 1111 1113 2211 Total # Takers 435 186 255 203 323 127 171 130 Response Rate 59.67 62.84 65.38 61.52 52.35 52.48 52.29 67.36 Average # Correct 3.17 4.28 4.91 4.26 2.81 4.35 5.13 4.56 % out of 100 45.25 61.10 70.10 60.80 60.00 64.16 64.16

Full Report for MATH 1070 Report for MATH 1101 Report for MATH 1111 Report for MATH 1113 Report for MATH 2211

**M 2: Homework and Projects (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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 O2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O4: Written communication**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O6: Quantitative skills**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O7: Contemporary issues**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**Target for O8: Technology**

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

About one third students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments are given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

**M 3: Class participation and individual contact (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
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 O2: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Written communication**
Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**
Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Quantitative skills**
Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Contemporary issues**
Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Technology**
Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students actively participated in the classes. However, occasionally, some students were absent from classes. It was observed that 80% of students were able to formulate their questions and comments clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Technology Projects (O: 9)**
Students use technology (such as MAPLE and MATLAB) to solve problems and communicate the results of these investigations. Also, LaTeX is introduced and students must typeset at least one project report using LaTeX.

**Target for O9: Quantitative Literacy - Core**
Success Rating of 70%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Math 4991, 80% of students demonstrated reasonable grasp of MAPLE and LaTeX. MATH 1101 students Each student had to complete at least one project (most were required to complete several projects, or one project with multiple parts) that required them to show proficiency in each of the 6 “Common Course Outcomes” listed earlier. Many instructors graded each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
- Quantitative skills | Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs | Technology | Written communication
- Measurable: Homework and Projects | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
- Quantitative skills | Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs | Technology | 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

M 5: Presentations (O: 4, 7, 8)
Each student is required to give at least one presentation in class on a mathematical topic of their own choice. The format of the presentation may involve use of overhead projector, slides or writing on the whiteboard.

Target for O4: Written communication
It is expected that upon completion of the program, a graduate is able to communicate mathematics accurately and comprehensibly. A good presentation should be (a). well organized (b). mathematically sound (c). on an interesting topic (d). easy to comprehend (e). interactive with the audience

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has decided to use the newly created cap-stone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) as the primary means to assess the achievements of mathematics majors. As this course was offered for the first time in Fall 2007, only 7 students has taken this course so far. All students did reasonably well in their presentations.

Target for O7: Contemporary issues
It is expected that upon completion of the program, a graduate is able to communicate mathematics accurately and comprehensibly. A good presentation should be (a). well organized (b). mathematically sound (c). on an interesting topic (d). easy to comprehend (e). interactive with the audience

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has decided to use the newly created cap-stone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) as the primary means to assess the achievements of mathematics majors. As this course was offered for the first time in Fall 2007, only 7 students has taken this course so far. All students did reasonably well in their presentations.

Target for O8: Technology
It is expected that upon completion of the program, a graduate is able to communicate mathematics accurately and comprehensibly. A good presentation should be (a). well organized (b). mathematically sound (c). on an interesting topic (d). easy to comprehend (e). interactive with the audience

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has decided to use the newly created cap-stone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) as the primary means to assess the achievements of mathematics majors. As this course was offered for the first time in Fall 2007, only 7 students has taken this course so far. All students did reasonably well in their presentations.

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

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

Align MATH 1070 Projects

For MATH 1070, some instructors provided their students the opportunity to attend Excel seminars in the Mathematics Interactive Learning Environment, while others simply provided handouts (these handouts were available to all instructors). An analysis and comparison of student performance based on these two activities and the impact they had will be performed this summer. Additional seminars can be scheduled if they are found to be beneficial to student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Align MATH 1101 Projects

For MATH 1101, the students' ability to resubmit work until essentially perfect both enhances the learning of these students of both the mathematics and the technology, but allows these students the opportunity for positive experiences in both areas. The requirement of interpreting and writing about these interpretations also supports the General Learning Outcome of written communication. This summer, further analysis of the quality of student work, including the number of times resubmissions were necessary, will inform the instructors of how they might improve student work.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Data Assessment

Item analyses will be performed on the outcome of each assessment (both QL quizzes and course assessments), both aggregated and disaggregated by class. It is expected that the assessment data will be available for ½ of the enrolled students (unless the assessments are required course elements).

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Early introduction to mathematical software

Students should be introduced to powerful mathematics software such as MAPLE and MATLAB in 2000 and 3000 level mathematics courses.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Johan Hattingh
Additional Resources: All 2000 and higher level mathematics courses should be taught in classrooms with computers. MAPLE and MATLAB should be available in all such classrooms.

Enhance 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 courses. More generally, pay more attention to proofs in all upper level mathematics courses.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Homework and Projects | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary issues
  Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs | Technology | Written communication
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Johan Hattingh

Include MATH 1070
Look to include students in MATH 1070 in the QL pre- and post-assessments.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Quantitative Literacy Quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Valerie Miller

Written Communication
Ways to improve student communication of their findings will be determined and implemented in the fall semester. The use of common formats (e.g., Word) will be discussed.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Technology Projects | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative Literacy - Core
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Valerie Miller

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are moving toward using the capstone course (Math 4991) as the primary means to assess student learning outcomes for undergraduate mathematics majors. As the capstone course is a required course and is taken only by seniors, hopefully we get fairly accurate assessment of final learning outcomes of undergraduate mathematics majors. In turn, we can arrive at suitable action plans to improve student learning.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Some students still can not write sound mathematical proofs. The department need to focus more attention on this objective.
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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. The M.Ed. major in Secondary Mathematics Education seeks to advance early and mid-career mathematics teachers’ ability to effectively implement standards-based instructional practices. The program's chief goal—to strengthen secondary students’ mathematical understandings—is achieved, in part, by providing mathematics teachers with opportunities to deepen their understandings of learners from diverse backgrounds and to explore issues of equity in mathematics classrooms within urban environments. The program prepares teachers to conduct action research in the context of their own classrooms in order to inform instruction, and to share the knowledge gained in a professional community of teachers. Through engaging teachers in advanced mathematics coursework, the program strengthens teachers’ mathematical content knowledge. In general, the Program of Study is framed by the principles and standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.</td>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.</td>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience (M: 1, 7, 9, 15, 16)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: Participates in profession`s learning communities (M: 8, 15, 17)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M 3: Recognizes individual differences in students (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.</td>
<td>Recognizes individual differences in her/his students and can adjust practice accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6: Works collaboratively with parents/community (M: 18, 19)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works collaboratively with parents and community.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**M 6: Values the whole student (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Appreciates how knowledge field is created (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates how knowledge in his/her field is created, organized and linked to other disciplines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Participates in profession`s learning communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates multiple paths toward learning/development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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.

**M 11: Can promote learning/development in group settings (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Can promote learning/development in group settings.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**M 12: Places a premium on student learning (O: 1, 3)**
Places a premium on student involvement in the process of learning/development.

**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.

**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.

**M 13: Regularly assesses student progress (O: 3)**
Regularly assesses student progress.

**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.

**M 14: Is mindful of objectives of learning (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**M 15: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research (O: 4, 5)**
Seeks the advice of others and draws on relevant research to improve his/her practice.

**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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Values personal reflection in his/her professional (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values personal reflection in his/her professional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Values collaborating with others (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values the importance of collaborating with other professionals in the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Works collaboratively with parents (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works collaboratively with parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Works collaboratively with parents/community**
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Takes advantage of community resources (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes advantage of community resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Works collaboratively with parents/community**
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.

### 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
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply expertise for learning and development

**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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating
- **Outcome/Objective:** Reflects on & learns from professional experience
Case Study/Action Research implemented, EDMT 7560
The Case Study/Action Research is a culminating project for all assignments in this class. It pulls together your work on the GPS, learning theories, the assigned readings, the Georgia Mathematics Conference, and the NCTM principles and standards. For the Case Study, select a class or course that you will investigate this semester. You will study this class with respect to the mathematical tasks and cognitive demand. Keep a journal in which you record a descriptive narrative of your weekly investigations.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Thomas

Creation of new course, EDMT 8430
Consistent with the College of Education’s mission to develop teachers for urban environments this course advances teachers’ understandings of the sociocultural and sociohistorical implications of mathematics and mathematics teaching, learning, and research. Throughout the course, a focus on cultural, economic, political, and social aspects of mathematics and mathematics teaching, learning, and research is maintained. In turn, this focus broadens mathematics teachers’, teacher-educators’, and researchers’ knowledge base, assisting them in implementing the principles and standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Implementation Description: Fall 2006, course first taught spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Stinson, MED MTE program changes

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives? Students develop the skill of how to reflecting on their practice via the Case Study/Action Research; implemented in EDMT 7560.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? Further development in the sociocultural issues of mathematics and mathematics teaching and learning; new course created EDMT 8430.
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
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
75% 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
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
63% 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.

Target for O10: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
61% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively Teach Diverse Groups of Learners.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 1)
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 O1: 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.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
66% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and Uses Multiple Instructional Strategies.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating (O: 2)**
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 O2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
58% of candidates met Standard 5: Can Motivate and Manage Student Learning.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 3)**
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 O3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
55% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 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 7.

**Target for O4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
55% of all candidates have met Standard 7: Can Effectively Plan for Instruction.

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 5)**
Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8.

**Target for O5: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
55% 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**
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 2006-2007 - 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

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

72% 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 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 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 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 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
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

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

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

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

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

Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2007-2008 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**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 2007  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2007-2008.
Maintain and Monitor

Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will modify the current design and implementation of the methods courses and continue to monitor the stated learning outcomes during 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty
learning outcomes during 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
School and Community Involvement: We will modify the syllabi to continue reinforcing the involvement of student teachers in community activities in the student teaching practices in the spring semester.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify Syllabi and Discourse
Faculty will continue to integrate appropriate content into syllabi and monitor the discourse in university and schools’ classrooms.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: summer 2007
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 courses and e-portfolio assessments, students have demonstrated continuous progress in their disposition, knowledge and performance. Our implementation of two or three student teachers at a school site for their internship has proven to have some effects in our students’ performance. However, we will continue to monitor this effort. Relationships across the school and university communities continue to build for improvement in student performance in these communities. However, these outcomes have not been reflected in our STARS data assessments. The data seems to be a reflection of our earlier assessments [summer/fall] in the academic year of 2006-2007. Feedback from faculty of the STARS’ outcomes indicates that there is a misunderstanding of the rating procedures.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In particular, faculty’s rating as currently recorded has demonstrated a high need for modifications to our program but other assessments have indicated differently. Faculty will (1) continue to make modifications in the methods courses, (2) use Livetext.com database to systematically document data, and (3) continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Mathematics MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**M 2: Show computer skills. (O: 1)**

Students should be familiar with some major statistics computer packages, such as SAS, S-plus.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**M 3: To read and understand the research articles. (O: 1)**

Students should be able to read and understand the research reports/articles in statistics.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**M 4: To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 4)**

Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**M 5: Analyze and interpret data through proofs. (O: 4)**

Students should be able to analyze and interpret data through either proofs or algorithms.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.**
### M 6: Show effective written communication. (O: 5)
Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

### M 7: Show key knowledges in statistical theories. (O: 2)
Students should articulate key mathematical/statistical concepts and theories.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

### M 8: Know the update knowledges in statistics. (O: 2)
Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

### M 9: Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3)
Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

### M 10: Understand research problems. (O: 2)
Students show the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.**
At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

### M 11: Show an appreciation for history of mathematics. (O: 2)
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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**
All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.
**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:**

All 14 students with concentration in statistics who received MS degree in summer, fall 2006 and spring 2007 met the target performance.

**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
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of final exams for each semester.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8200

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.
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
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

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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8200

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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
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: 2006-2007
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**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:** 2006-2007  
**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?**

Math assessment analysis: In the fall semester, we evaluated the extent to which students achieved specific learning outcomes in two 8000 level math courses: Math 8220 and Math 8440. The students were evaluated on a scale of one to four on each of the learning outcomes for the courses. Averaged over outcomes, for Math 8220 the scores ranged from 2.8 to 3.9. For Math 8440 the scores ranged from 1.75 to 3.75.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Middle Childhood Education MEd**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**  
Of an N=9, 88.89% were at or above target, while 11.11% were below target.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Of an N=6 83.33% were at or above target level, while 16.67% were below.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Of an N=9, 88.89% were at or above target level, while 11.11% were below target.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Of an N=3 100% were at or above target 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Of an N=6 66.67% were at or above target level, while 33.33% were below target.

### 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

#### Program continuation for only Math and Science

The Advanced Masters MCE program will be discontinued, primarily due to low enrollment numbers and shift in programmatic focus. The Mathematics and Science options will continue.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2006-2007
- **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 2006-2007
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The current students enrolled in the program will continue to be supported to meet the outlined goals and objectives.

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

The current students enrolled in the program will continue to be supported to meet the outlined goals and objectives.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Executive Summary

The Advanced Masters MCE MEd program will be discontinued. However, students currently enrolled in the program will continue to be supported to meet the standards at or above the target level.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Middle Grades Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT**

*(As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 PM EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>Understands student development re: learning (M: 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>Uses communication skills and technology (M: 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6</td>
<td>Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7</td>
<td>Practices professional reflection (M: 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8</td>
<td>Involves school and community in learning (M: 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9</td>
<td>Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10</td>
<td>Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 3)**

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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 3 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 3.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 7 rating (O: 5)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.
M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 8 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 8.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 9 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 9.

Target for O7: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating (O: 8)
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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program.

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.
Examination of Course Content and Standards

LL/SS faculty have noted a need to examine the degree to which courses in this program(a) reflect an emphasis on middle school philosophy, research, and theory, and(b) refrain from overlapping in content. In 2007, faculty will analyze the content of the program in light of these issues and make any changes deemed necessary with implementation of these changes occurring the following year. These changes have the potential for impacting all learning outcomes.

Raise proficiency target for cohort to 90%

Students’ performance proficiency percentage for 2006-2007 is 100%(LA/SS students). The expected proficiency target will be raised from 75% of the cohort to 90%.

To improve MA/SC Assessment Data Analysis

One identified need throughout the year for the program has been for timely, consistent assessment data that can be better used to track student progress and growth through a variety of venues: initial interviews, e-portfolio, practicum measures, etc.

To improve MA/SC program clarity

It has been well noted amongst the Department faculty that what students and faculty know about the TEEMS program, its course requirements, and content expectations will be critical in sustaining recruitment and success. This action item aims to provide the Math/Science with the kind of clarity that is necessary through centralization and uniformity of documents, increased attention to accurate advisement info and independent student self-monitoring.

To Improve Quality of Practicum Experiences MA/SC

Analysis of the program’s strengths and weaknesses during the year by faculty team members and students revealed a need to ensure greater quality in the placement of practicum students and student teachers in environments where high quality mathematics and science teaching occurs.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
100% of students (5 of 5 LL/SS students) were rated at or above the expected proficiency level for this program. This is a vast improvement compared to 2005-2006. The assessments show that the mathematics science program is making significant progress in helping teachers to develop into teachers that will have an impact in schools.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The target percentage for proficiency will be raised to 90% of the cohort. While the students performed well on the learning outcomes of the program, faculty have expressed an interest in examining program content in light of the emphasis on Middle School content and philosophy as outlined by the National Middle School Association. For that reason, an Action Item has been included for next year to address this area.

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 06-07, the program had approximately 130 students; 37 students completed the program.

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.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: 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,
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 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.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs

**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.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs

**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.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs

**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.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.3 Quality professional programs

**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.

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
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
94% of MSD 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 student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
94% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
97% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
Ratings on lesson planning, P-12 pupil outcomes, and classroom performance at the final pracitcum rating 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 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.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

98% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

### M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

98% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

### M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

97% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

### M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

97% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

95% of MSD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

95% of MSD students were rated at or above the expected level.
94% of MSD 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

98% of MSD 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

**Monitor Data in New program**

MSD program faculty will continue to monitor the STARS data collection process and its alignment with GSTEP, PSC, and NCATE accrediting processes. Recommendations will be forthcoming as needed. Review at the May 07 graduate program committee revealed good progress for students in all areas.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** June 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSD Program Coordinator

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

- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Involves school and community in learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands student development regarding learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Can motivate and manage students for learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses communication skills and technology
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Practices professional reflection

- **Implementation Description:** June 2008
- **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 continue to be most positive in all areas. Students continue to meet program learning outcomes.
**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: 7, 11)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication--major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration--major</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>
</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>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government</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>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 2: Places music in historical and cultural context (M: 8)**

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

<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>8 Critical Thinking--core</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>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</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>
<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>4.3 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 3: Technology in listening, performing, creating (M: 6, 10)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
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: 9)

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: 5)

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: 2, 4)

Demonstrates functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies

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
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
13 Technology--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 4.2 Facilities
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 7: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians (M: 3)**

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: 1)**

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

---

**SLO 9: Critical Thinking--Core (M: 12)**

An expected outcome of critical thinking is that students will be able to: Interpret from an interdisciplinary approach the ways in which a given culture expresses itself through music by examining its meaning and value in terms of the cultural influences upon musical styles, traditions, genres, and performance practices.

**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: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
44 (100%) of 2-year completers were admitted to upper division for F07; 59 students began as 1st semester freshmen in F2005, thus the 2-year retention rate is 74.5%. 17/20 students enrolled in capstone internships were assessed as excellent, 2 were assessed as very good, and 1 was assessed as satisfactory

**M 2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
In Mus 4480, 6 students were excellent, 1 was good, and 1 was unsatisfactory. In 4490, 7 students were assessed as excellent, 3 good, and 1 satisfactory. Of the total of 19 students, 18 (94.7%) made satisfactory or better progress.

**M 3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
74/77 (96%) students enrolled in relevant classes were rated as satisfactory or better. 57 were rated excellent, 14 good, and 3 satisfactory.

**M 4: Piano and conducting proficiency (O: 6)**
Students demonstrate satisfactory or better proficiency in Piano IV (MUS 2720) and Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) as incidated 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 evlauations.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
28/32 (87.5%) students received satisfactory or better assessments in Piano IV. All 14 students (100%) in conducting were assessed as "good" or above, with 12 students assessed as excellent.

**M 5: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100 percent of enrolled students demonstrated satisfactory or better progress in Mus 3010 -- 12 were excellent, 1 was very good, and 2 were good. In Mus 4210, of 11 students, 7 were assessed as excellent, 3 very good, and 1 good, all demonstrating satisfactory progress.

**M 6: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100 percent of 17 enrolled students earned a grade of C or better.
**M 7: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

43/49 enrolled students (87.8%) scored C or better in Theory IV, with 5 As, 21 Bs, and 17 Cs. In Music History II, 24/27 completing students (88.9%) scored C or better, with 6 As, 11 Bs, and 7 Cs.

**M 8: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

In SP07, 24/27 completing students (88.9%) scored C or better in Mus 4810. 9/11 completing students (81.8%) scored C or better in Mus 4820.

**M 9: 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 2006-2007 - 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 10: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100 percent of enrolled students earned a grade of C or better, with 4 As, 3 Bs, and 1 C.

**M 11: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Jury placement level distributions for SP07: Juries performed F06: 184 Individual performance jury placements: Level I: 4 Level II: 49 Level III: 10 Level IV: 49 Level V: 7 Level VI: 46 Level VII: 6 Level VIII: 13 Of 184 juried students, 173 advanced and 11 were retained. Of those who advanced, ratings were: 58 satisfactory advancement; 96 satisfactory advancement; 30 outstanding advancement.

**M 12: Critical thinking in core (O: 9)**

All students were asked to write two essays (about 500 pages each). They choose two topics out of four choices. These were: 1. Discuss the role of religion in Western society during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (approx. 700 C.E.- 1600) and its influence on musical activity and evolution. 2. Analyze the impact of music in early 19th-century Western society. Be sure to include some discussion on the role of women and amateur performers. 3. Compare the musical characteristics of TWO CONSECUTIVE time periods ("Renaissance and Baroque", for example). Be sure to discuss social developments as well as some comparison between music and another artistic discipline. 4. Discuss the social, artistic, and economic context in the American South during the years preceding the emergence of Jazz (you may start with the Civil War). Explain each one of its musical influences. Finally, answer this question: How a type of music of undeniable popular and folk roots became a musical activity performed by classically trained performers, taught in universities, and enjoyed by peoples of radically different geographical and cultural origins?

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking–Core**

80% of students will earn a "C" or better on their reasoning on the essays. Two-thirds will earn "B" or better.
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
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
Implementation Description: AY07
Responsible Person/Group: faculty; ad hoc assessment committee
Additional Resources: Sufficient SOM faculty and release time to provide incentives for this kind of additional service

Improve learning outcomes on syllabi
Clearer articulation of learning outcomes and related assessments on syllabi, and their alignment with SOM and GSU outcomes, will assist determinations of progress.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description:

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
96% of students earned a "C" or better and 82% earned at least a "B"/
Improve specificity of assessments
Learning outcomes and rubrics for assessment must exist across all areas and programs and offer richer data for ongoing tracking of student progress.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge/skills for career development | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
- Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
- Measure: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV | 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

Incorporate assessment data into SOM database
Expand the SOM database to include assessment data to ease year-end reporting
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
- Measure: Knowledge/skills for career development | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
- Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
- 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

Targeted assessments
The SOM should identify target assessment areas, including areas in which to assess writing/comprehension skills (e.g., recital program notes), creativity (e.g., improvisation/composition) and technology applications (e.g., use of technology across courses). Procedures for school-wide assessment should also be put in place.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge/skills for career development | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
- Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
- 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: Teaching music | Outcome/Objective: Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians
- Measure: Technology proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Student progress and levels of achievement are generally indicative that students likely to succeed are being admitted to the music
Measures of progress, however, do not always give a uniform picture of comparative achievement, which is something the School of Music should address.

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

Many music majors are more comfortable in performing arenas than in theoretical/academic areas. Continued effort should be made to relate learning outcomes in theoretical/academic areas with performance goals, thus ensuring a well-rounded education. Assessments indicate that further work must be done on clarifying expected learning outcomes with students and engaging them in reflection on their own work, e.g., through digital portfolios.

---

### 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/repertoire 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 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

**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

**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
- 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 2006-2007 - 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.

### M2: 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 2006-2007 - 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.

### M3: 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 2006-2007 - 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.

### M4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Of 7 enrolled students, 100 percent were rated as having made excellent or outstanding progress.

### M5: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
5/5 students received excellent or outstanding assessments in pedagogy of music theory.

### M6: 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 2006-2007 - 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.
Rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes

The School of Music must develop rubrics across performance and academic areas to provide increased evidence-based indicators of student progress.

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/reertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: AY 07

Responsible Person/Group: faculty, 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/reertoire 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/reertoire 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

Focused data collection

Target areas for data collection must be established and consistently monitored, e.g., recital program notes

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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/reertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: 5/1/08

Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty
Additional Resources: Dedicated time and ad hoc committee

Rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes

The School of Music must develop rubrics across performance and academic areas to provide increased evidence-based indicators of student progress.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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/reertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: 5/1/08

Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty
Additional Resources: Release time is essential -- there is insufficient time to complete this work giving workloads in the School of Music
Student Portfolios
Electronic portfolios should be developed to monitor student progress in School of Music -- it has been recommended that this be incorporated into the computer technology class

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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

Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration/faculty and/or ad hoc committee
Additional Resources: Dedicated time

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments indicate that standards of progress generally are being met by graduate students. This indicates that selectivity in admissions is paying dividends in terms of numbers of students who successfully complete the program at high levels. The majority of master’s students complete the program in two years, with the exception of music education students who tend to be full-time teachers.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
While progress is generally good across outcomes, attention must be given to specificity of outcomes and associated rubrics. Performance tends to be assessed at quite high levels, with more dispersion of ratings in academic-theoretical areas. A balance between these two is essential for a well-rounded graduate education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Collaborate (M: 7)</th>
<th>Collaborate with individuals, families, groups, the community and other health care providers to maximize positive health patterns. Relevant Associations: CCNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Education/Core Curriculum Associations | 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Respect for Diversity (M: 8)</th>
<th>Demonstrate respect for human diversity when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community. Relevant Associations: CCNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Education/Core Curriculum Associations | 1 Written Communication--major  
3 Oral Communication--major  
9 Contemporary Issues--major |
| Institutional Priority Associations | 1.5 Global, cultural perspectives  
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning |
| Strategic Plan Associations | 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces (M: 6, 9)</th>
<th>Incorporate knowledge of the effects of sociopolitical, economic and ecological forces on nursing and provision of health care. Relevant Associations: CCNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Education/Core Curriculum Associations | 3 Oral Communication--major  
5 Collaboration--major  
7 Critical Thinking--major  
9 Contemporary Issues--major |
| Institutional Priority Associations | 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning |
| Strategic Plan Associations | 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Ethical and legal issues (M: 1)</th>
<th>Incorporate knowledge of ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care. Relevant Associations: CCNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 | 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning |
Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 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

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

1.4 Interdisciplinary research and educational programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Knowledge of self, science and humanities (M: 11, 12)
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

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

Institutional Priority Associations

1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 9: Critical Thinking (M: 10)
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

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

Institutional Priority Associations

2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Professional accountability (legal and ethical) 100% of the students enrolled in clinical courses in summer 2006 received a satisfactory in the identified area. 99% of the students enrolled in clinical courses in fall 2006 and spring 2007 received a satisfactory in the identified area

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students taking this course during academic year 2006-2007 obtained a grade of C or higher.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Results are based on telephone survey conducted by GRAs. SP 04 graduates: 0% indicated they were participating in research (N=2); SP 05 graduates 66% indicated they were participating in research (N=3)

**M 4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The top 35% of the junior and senior students were invited to join Sigma Theta Tau International (50 students) and of those invited 72% (36 students) decided to join.

**M 5: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
Results based on telephone survey conducted by GRAs: SP 2004 graduates - 50% indicated they were actively involved (N=2); SP 2005 graduates - 66% indicated they were actively involved (N=3).

**M 6: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in clinical course during the 2006-2007 academic year received a satisfactory for their overall performance where they incorporate their knowledge of the identified areas.

**M 7: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students received a grade of satisfactory in the required area.

**M 8: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the identified clinical courses in summer and fall 2006 obtained a satisfactory in the required area. 99.5% of the students enrolled in the identified clinical courses in spring 2007 obtained a satisfactory in the identified area.

M 9: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students taking this course received a grade of C or better. A total 102 students completed this course in academic year 2006 - 2007 with a grade distribution of 45 A, 39 B+, 15 B, 2 C+, and 1 C.

M 10: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Of the 74 graduating seniors only 48 (64%) completed the standardized critical thinking exam; of those completing the exam 42 (89%) attained the established passing standard.

M 11: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The most recent GA Board of Nursing verbal report indicates that the first time pass rate for 2006 was 95%.

M 12: Exit Exam (O: 8)
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 meet or exceed an established passing score on the standardized exit examination on their first attempt; 100% will meet or exceed the established passing score in no more than 3 attempts. 100% of the RN to BS students will complete the required exit activity successfully.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
90% of the students taking the standardized exit exam in both fall 2006 and spring 2007 did not achieve the established passing rate. There were a total of 74 graduates who took the exam and only 50% obtained the required pass rate on their first attempt. 96% met or exceeded the established passing score after the third attempt. 100% of the RN to BS students completed their exit activity successfully.

M 13: 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, 3610, 3710, 3810, 4510, 4610) in the section: Demonstrate application of current standards of professional nursing practice.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in clinical courses during the academic year 2006-2007 obtained a satisfactory in the identified area.

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):
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
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

Alumni Surveys
Need to improve process for tracking alumni activities. The survey developed during the 2005-2006 academic year would yield the desired data however the administration of the phone survey was ineffective.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director of Undergraduate Program
Additional Resources: Funds to hire a GRA who can devote necessary time to completing the alumni phone survey. An alternative to this approach would be to assign staff support to complete this project.

Clinical Evaluation Tool
Currently the clinical evaluation tool is being used to assess five outcomes. The tool needs to be reviewed and revised to more appropriately assess these outcomes or additional methods of assessing these outcomes need to be developed.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Diversity | Outcome/Objective: Respect for Diversity
- Measure: Clinical Evaluation Tool - ethical and legal | Outcome/Objective: Ethical and legal issues
- Measure: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Multidisciplinary | Outcome/Objective: Collaborate
- Measure: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Professional Standards | Outcome/Objective: Standards of Professional Nursing
- Measure: Clinical Evaluation Tool - Sociopolitical etc. | Outcome/Objective: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee and Clinical Course Faculty

Evidence Based Practice
Evaluate incorporation of evidence based practice content across all courses and assure that content in research course builds on and reinforces previous content and provides firm base for later use of evidence based practice.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: NUR 3500 | Outcome/Objective: Nursing Research

Implementation Description: May 2008
Exit Exam Pass Rate Standard
The required passing score for the exit exam will be evaluated for appropriateness. The 2005-2006 assessment report had an action plan related to this item but the exit exam changed during the academic year so an evaluation of the new exam passing standard is now needed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Exit Exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of self, science and humanities

**Implementation Description:** November 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee

Exit Exam Preparation
Will develop mechanisms to assist graduating students to better prepare for the exit exam in order to increase pass rate on first attempt.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Exit Exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of self, science and humanities

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee

First time NCLEX pass rate
The target level for first time pass rate was originally set at 80%. Based on the most recent first time pass rate the target level will be adjusted upward to equal or surpass the national mean (85.5%).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** NCLEX
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of self, science and humanities

**Implementation Description:** Target date will be fall 2007.
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee members and undergraduate program faculty.

Increase number of inductees to Sigma Theta Tau
The Epsilon Alpha Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau is associated with but not under the auspices of the school of nursing. Therefore this action item is a suggestion not a mandate. The suggestion is for the chapter to aim to increase the percentage of students and/or community members who accept the invitation to join Sigma Theta Tau International. Currently only about 72% of those invited decide to join. It would be ideal to increase this to 85 to 90%. This change could be accomplished by better educating students about the benefits of joining the organization, by recruiting community leaders to become members, and by better communicating payment options for students who do not have the funds to cover the cost of joining.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Sigma Theta Tau
- **Outcome/Objective:** Value of Professional Commitment

**Implementation Description:** May 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty and Board Members of the Epsilon Alpha chapter of Sigma Theta Tau International

Sociological, political, economic, legal, ethical
Conduct a curriculum evaluation process to determine if these topics are being adequately addressed in NURS 3300 or if they need to be included in other courses as well.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** NUR 3300 Grade
- **Outcome/Objective:** Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee subgroup on Curriculum

Standardized Critical Thinking Test
Will develop mechanism to assure that 100% of graduating seniors complete the standardized critical thinking test and that a minimum of 85% obtain a passing score.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director and Administrative Coordinator UG Program, Undergraduate Program Committee
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 the program continues to improve in a variety of areas. The most apparent area of continued improvement is the first time pass rate on the National Council Licensure Exam (NCLEX). This continues to be an important indicator of program effectiveness and is used by many external bodies as a measure of program efficacy. The Board of Regents has encouraged programs to aim for a 95% first time pass rate. Our assessments reveal that we are achieving that standard. The ability to critically think is one of the accreditation standards used to evaluate nursing programs. The results of the standardized critical thinking exam demonstrate that the graduates of our program have the ability to utilize high levels of critical thinking; this is an important strength. The overall results of this year’s assessments demonstrate the high caliber of graduates we are producing and reinforce the soundness of our educational program.

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

Our assessments continue to show that students are struggling with the exit exam process. This is a challenging situation because we do not want to minimize the importance of preparing for the NCLEX but also want to make the exit exam process less stressful for students and leave them with a feeling of success. During 2005-2006 the plan was to re-evaluate the passing standard for the exam to determine if the level we had set was appropriate. This was not done because the exam was changed and re-normed. Now that the new exam has been used for one cycle the Undergraduate Program Committee will work with the exam provider to determine if our passing standard is appropriate. The 2005-2006 assessment plan used the End of Program Evaluation as an outcome measure for several items. During the 2006-2007 academic year the decision was made to discontinue use of this evaluation measure. Thus the assessment plan for 2006-2007 had to be revised. The use of the revised measures needs to be closely monitored to determine if the data yielded is comprehensive enough or if additional assessment measures need to be developed. As has been mentioned in the action plans, the alumni follow up process needs refinement and continued monitoring. In the 2005-2006 assessment report it was noted that the critical thinking scores for that academic year still needed to be compiled. This still has not been accomplished due to a change in the test format and a change in staff support. In addition, the 2006-2007 assessment report determined that only 64% (N=48) of the graduating seniors (N=74) completed the required critical thinking exam. This is an area that needs close monitoring over the next assessment cycle. Overall, as noted above our assessments reveal several areas where we can improve in our method of data collection and method of outcome assessment.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2006-2007 Nursing MS

As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 PM EST

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

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, 10)
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 Credentialing 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

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, 11)
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 Credentialing 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

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Participation in Research (M: 4, 5, 9)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in research to support and promote nursing knowledge and to improve advanced practice nursing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Collaboration in Provision of Health Care (M: 3, 12)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with individuals, families, communities and others for the purpose of providing nursing care and promoting health and wellness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care (M: 3, 5, 13)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the influence of socio-political, economic, and ecological forces on nursing practice, health, health care delivery, and health care providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Global, cultural perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing (M: 6)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate knowledge of legal and ethical issues in advanced practice nursing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Quality professional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Professional Commitment (M: 3, 4, 5, 14)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate professional commitment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLO 8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization (M: 3, 7, 15, 16)
Demonstrate behaviors consistent with the selected advanced practice role.
Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialing 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

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 Credentialing 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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Success in Certification (O: 1)
Graduates will be successful in passing the certification examination in their specialty area.

**Target for O1: Integrating Knowledge into Practice**
80% of graduates of the master's program will pass a certification exam in their area of master's specialization within one year after graduation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
77.8% (14/18) of 1 year post-graduates passed a certification exam in their area of master's specialization.

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**
In any given year 90% of the master’s students will successfully progress and/or graduate in their area of study.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
In 2006-2007 there were 151 students enrolled in the master’s program; 90.1% (n=136) of the students were successfully progressing through the program (n = 96; 63.6%) or graduated (n = 40; 26.5%) graduated; 15 (9.9%) students were suspended;

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% (%7/8) of master’s program graduates 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% (%7/8) of master’s program graduates 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% (7/8) of master’s program graduates 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% (7/8) of master’s program graduates 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% (7/8) of master’s program graduates 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 seek post-master's education by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 3.7% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave one or more presentations at a professional meeting, and 3.7% (1/25) have served on an editorial board. 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. None (0/26) of the master’s graduates were enrolled in doctoral education.

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 seek post-master's education by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 3.7% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave one or more presentations at a professional meeting, and 3.7% (1/25) have served on an editorial board. 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. None (0/26) 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 seek post-master's education by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 3.7% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave one or more presentations at a professional meeting, and 3.7% (1/25) have served on an editorial board. 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. None (0/26) 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (8/8) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 60% (6/10) of master’s graduates were actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. Master’s graduates were involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next five measures. By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 4% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting, and 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 56% (14/25) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities.
48.1% (13/27) of the master’s graduates are members of Sigma Theta Tau.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% (8/8) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 60% (6/10) of master’s graduates were actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. Master’s graduates were involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next five measures. By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 4% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting, and 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 56% (14/25) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 48.1% (13/27) of the master’s graduates are members of Sigma Theta Tau.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% (8/8) of master’s graduates have membership in a professional nursing organization by 1 year post-graduation. 60% (6/10) of master’s graduates were actively involved in a professional nursing organization by 3 years post-graduation. Master’s graduates were involved in some type of scholarly activity by 5 years post-graduation; see next five measures. By 5 years post-graduation: 11.5% (3/26) of master’s graduates served as a consultant, 7.7% (2/26) of master’s graduates published in a refereed journal, 4% (1/25) of master’s graduates published in a non-refereed journal, 26.9% (7/26) of the master’s graduates gave a presentation at a professional meeting, and 38.5% (10/26) of the master’s graduates were involved in research activities. 56% (14/25) of the master’s graduates reported being involved in community service activities. 48.1% (13/27) of the master’s graduates are members of Sigma Theta Tau.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students who passed their clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical advanced nursing practice through the successful completion of their clinical practicum which evaluates ethical practice. With the available information we determined that 100% of the master’s graduates practice within the scope of their practice as set forth by the Nurse Practice Act as evidenced by successful certification and continued recognition of advanced practice 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

5.9% (2/34) of the master’s students received an award from professional or scholarly organizations or from an academic institution in 2006-2007.

**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. 85% of graduates having completed their master’s programs 1, 3, and 5 years previously will indicate that they evaluate concepts and theories in nursing in advanced nursing practice.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

86.2% (25/29) of the graduating students reported that they evaluate concepts and theories in nursing in advanced nursing practice. 88.8% (24/27) of 1, 3, and 5 post-graduate master’s alumni reported that they evaluate concepts and theories in nursing in advanced nursing practice.

**M 9: Participation in Research (O: 3)**

At the end-of-program, students will indicate that they are prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.
### Target for O3: Participation in Research
50% of the graduating students will indicate that they engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 51.5% (n=15) indicated that the met/exceeded the program objective to engage in research.

### M 10: Integration of knowledge (self, science, etc.) (O: 1)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice.

### Target for O1: Integrating Knowledge into Practice
At end-of-program, 80% students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 82.7% (n=24) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice.

### M 11: Analyze various approaches in nursing practice (O: 2)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

### Target for O2: Activities for Improvement of Health
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 82.7% (n=24) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

### M 12: Collaboration in provision of care (O: 4)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others.

### Target for O4: Collaboration in Provision of Health Care
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others for the purpose of improving health.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 79.3% (n=23) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others for the purpose of improving health.

### M 13: Influence of socio-political forces on health care (O: 5)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, health care delivery and health care providers.

### Target for O5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, health care delivery and health care providers.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 79.3% (n=23) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, health care delivery and health care providers.

### M 14: Professional Commitment (O: 7)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment.

### Target for O7: Professional Commitment
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At end-of-program, 85.7% (n=26) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment.

### M 15: Demonstration of caring nursing practice (O: 8)
At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.
Target for O8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization

At end-of-program, 85% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

At end-of-program, 89.3% (n=25) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

M 16: Behaviors consistent with APN role (O: 8)

At end-of-program, students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

Target for O8: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization

At end-of-program, 85% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

At end-of-program, 89.3% (n=25) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

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

Examine PNP Program

Investigate probable causes for low passing rate of PNP certification exam for 2006-2007 graduates. In 2006 the PNP certification pass rate decreased overall results of entire MS program as reported by selected certifying bodies. [Note: we only received certification reports from some of the certifying bodies].

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Success in Certification | Outcome/Objective: Integrating Knowledge into Practice
Implementation Description: December 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel

Improve Data Analysis

Improve overall analysis of collected data to more accurately describe sample and more efficiently measure program objectives and outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Professional Membership and Activities | Outcome/Objective: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care
  | Participation in Research | Professional Commitment
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel

Improve Data Collection

Expand and improve overall data collection from current students and graduates to more efficiently measure program objectives and outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Scholarly Productivity | Outcome/Objective: Activities for Improvement of Health
  | Participation in Research | Professional Commitment
  Measure: Student Awards | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specialization
  Measure: Success in Certification | Outcome/Objective: Integrating Knowledge into Practice
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel
Additional Resources: Need annual certification exam reports from various specialty certification boards to more completely assess exam pass rates of graduates. Reports are not being routinely received from all certification boards.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We are pleased to see 90% of our students successfully progressing through our rigorous master’s advanced clinical practice programs. Their success speaks to strong selection criteria that ensure an academically strong student body. The success of our graduates in attaining advanced practice clinical positions is a tribute to the strength of the program and their knowledge and skills in providing care. We are pleased that so many of our master's graduates are participating in scholarly activities and are involved in professional nursing organizations within 5 years of graduation. Another strength is the fact that over 88% of our alumni indicated...
that they use theory to guide practice. Although the number of respondents is small, over 50% of our responding alumni indicated that they participate in research activities and other scholarly activities. In our end-of-program survey, our graduating students indicated that they met or exceeded the objectives of providing caring in nursing practice and demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice role.

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

Several areas will require our continued attention. An unusual number of our child health pediatric nurse practitioner students failed to pass the national certification examination on the first attempt. Usually our first attempt certification pass rate for all graduates exceeds 95%. We are not given the names of these students but will attempt to monitor the progression of our students to determine if those who are “just passing” have the necessary knowledge and skills to attain certification. We will continue to monitor our student attrition rate to see that this rate stays around 90%. Our MS program is rigorous but we want to make sure we select students who are most likely to succeed. We were displeased by the fact that about 20% of our graduating students did not feel they analyzed the influence of socio-political forces on health, health care delivery, and health care providers. Our students begin and end our program with two courses that expose them to these phenomena; in addition, this information is integrated into all the clinical courses as they provide care in the community. We will have to discuss our measurement of this phenomenon as well as how we present these concepts within the courses. Finally our connectedness with our graduates is not very strong, thus the small response rate to our alumni surveys. We will be discussing how we could continue our connection with them after graduation.

---
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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)

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
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 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)

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
1.3 Quality professional programs
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

**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)

**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

#### 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)

#### 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)

#### 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)

#### 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 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)

#### 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)

#### 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)

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Completion of PhD Program (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete PhD program requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 11: Leadership Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates will be recognized through awards, honors, activities in professional organizations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Implementation of Socially Relevant Research (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and alumni will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- From Fall 06 thru Spring 07, 100% (3/3) students completed socially relevant research on such topics as: "Illness Representations, Emotional Distress, Coping Strategies, and Coping Efficacy as Predictors of Patient Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes" "Factors Influencing Surrogate End-of-Life Healthcare Decision-Making for a Family Member with Alzheimer’s Disease" "Effect of the Adaptive Crawler on the Development of Infants with Spina Bifida, Age 6-12 Months"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Theory, Research and Vulnerable Populations (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Theory & Research with Vulnerable Populations**

90% of students will link theory and research to health issues in N8100 Vulnerable Populations.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- In Spring 2007, 100% (18/18) of the students demonstrated their ability to link theory and research to health issues by the successful completion of N8100 Health in Vulnerable Populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Human Interactions &amp; Health Promotion (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration in the NURS 8100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Human Environments Interactions &amp; Health Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students who enroll in N8100 Health in Vulnerable Populations will demonstrate their ability to analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (18/18) of the students taking N8100 Health in Vulnerable Populations passed the course demonstrating their ability to analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Issues in the Conduct of Research (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Issues Affecting the Conduct of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (3/3) 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 Fall 2006 and Spring 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2006-2007 students successfully demonstrated the use of the diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework as demonstrated by successful completion of the N8012 Qualitative Research Methods course [78.2% (18/23)] and their dissertation research [100%, (3/3)].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Application of Research Methods to Nursing Topics (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% if students who progress to dissertation will develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During 2006-2007, 100% (3/3) 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: * Illness Representations, Emotional Distress, Coping Strategies, and Coping Efficacy as Predictors of Patient Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes * Factors Influencing Surrogate End-of-Life Healthcare Decision-Making for a Family Member with Alzheimer’s Disease * Effect of the Adaptive Crawler on the Development of Infants with Spina Bifida, Age 6-12 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Completion of PhD Program (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD degree in nursing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Completion of PhD Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During 2006-2007, 39 students were enrolled in the doctoral program; 92.3% (36/39) are successfully progressing through the doctoral program (n=33) or successfully completed the requirement for graduation (n=3). One student withdrew; 2 students failed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and alumni will submit proposals for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and/or dissertation research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Funded Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% of the students will apply for internal or external funding (i.e. scholarships, NRSA awards, etc.) to support doctoral course work and dissertation projects. 10% of the students applying for funding to support doctoral work will be successful in obtaining funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of students responding to a 2005-2006 survey, 70% (7/10) applied for internal or external funding to support doctoral course work and dissertation research. 28.6% (2/7) of the students applying for funding to support doctoral work were successful in obtaining funds. Student data for 2006-2007 will be collected in July 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Submission of manuscripts for publication (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty/colleagues, for publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O8: Submission of Manuscripts**

30% of the students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Of students responding to our 2005-2006 survey, 40% (4/10) submitted manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication. Student data for 2006-2007 will be collected in July 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Of the ten students responding to a 2005-2006 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. Student data for 2006-2007 will be collected in July 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Of graduates responding to our survey, 7.4% (2/27) graduates have published in refereed journals by 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

The question regarding receipt of research funding was inadvertently left off the survey. However, 33.4% (3/9) of 5-year graduates reported participating in research. Also 37% (10/27) of 1, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Of the graduates responding to our survey, 25.9% (7/27) gave presentations at local, regional, national and/or international meetings and/or conferences.

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

**Examine N8012 Qualitative Research Methods**

Investigate probable causes for low passing rate of students enrolled in N8012 Qualitative Research Methods course in Spring 2007 semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry
- **Outcome/Objective:** Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry

- **Implementation Description:** December 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Cece Grindel

**Improve Data Collection**

Expand and improve overall data collection from current students and graduates to more efficiently measure program objectives and outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Increase Number of Graduate Presentations
Explore ways to encourage graduates to present at more professional meetings following completion of doctoral program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Presentation at Professional Meetings | Outcome/Objective: Presentations at Professionals Meetings
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel

Increase Number of Graduate Publications
Explore ways to encourage graduates to publish following completion of doctoral program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Publication in Refereed Journals | Outcome/Objective: Publication of Manuscripts
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This assessment of the doctoral program pointed out several strengths. Students in our doctoral program are moving forward with research that is relevant to health care and the overall health of the public. The students do use a variety of research methods as noted by the fact that our recent graduates conducted qualitative research projects during their program, settling on quantitative research studies (experimental design, descriptive correlational designs) for their dissertation work. With faculty support, students are just beginning to seek funding for their dissertation projects. A small number of students have succeeded in attaining funding to date. As we have just started to collect data on these submissions and successes in a formal way, we will be soon be able to determine how successful these students are in attaining funding. We will be collecting student data for the 2006-2007 academic year in July; at this time we will be better able to determine if the numbers of students submitting articles for publication are increasing. Our doctoral students are very active when it comes to presentations at professional conferences.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
For the first time in recent years we had several students (5/23) fail the qualitative research methods course. This is unusual and we have begun to examine what factors contributed to this degree of failure. We will continue to monitor attrition to see that the numbers are relatively low. We are examining the progress of the students who were unsuccessful to determine if there were qualification issues or if there was any way we could have been more supportive. Within the last year or two, doctoral faculty are stressing the need for publication and for grant writing to fund student research endeavors. We are seeing an increase in these activities and will continue to monitor student success in these arenas. We are disappointed to see that more of our doctoral graduates are not leading research endeavors. Although we cannot control “life after GSU” we will continue to stress the importance of health care research and the fact that, as graduates of our doctoral program, they have the skills to lead important research endeavors. In general, we hope to see in increase in the scholarly productivity of our alumni with better nurturing of our students. Alumni responses to our 1-, 3- and 5-year surveys is relatively low. We hope to develop strategies to keep our graduates involved with the School of Nursing and hope to increase participation in our surveys.
Demonstrate an understanding of the science of food and food policy in promotion of a healthy lifestyle and pleasurable eating in diverse population groups

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes V.42-V.62.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

**SLO 2: Integrate social sciences (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Integrate psychological, social and economic aspects of the environment and examine how they individually and collectively affect food and nutrition

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes III.31-III.34.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

**SLO 3: Utilize critical thinking skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Utilize critical thinking skills in the interpretation and application of research methodologies

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes IV.35-IV.41.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

**SLO 4: Demonstrate science understanding (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes II.17-II.30.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**SLO 5: Communicate effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Communicate effectively.

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes I.1-I.16.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major
3 Oral Communication--major

**SLO 6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Demonstrate an understanding of the role of nutrients and food in human health, disease prevention, health promotion, and medical nutrition therapy

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VI.63-VI.79.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**SLO 7: Apply knowledge of management principles (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Apply knowledge of management principles and systems in planning, monitoring, and evaluating dietetic services and practice and implementing of quality improvement programs

Relevant Associations: This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VII.80-VII.98.

**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

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O2: Integrate social sciences

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O5: Communicate effectively

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 7 -- 2 artifacts; Objective 8 -- 2 artifacts).

Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students met the portfolio requirements at the exemplary or proficient level (Objective 1 -- 11 artifacts; Objective 2 -- 6 artifacts; Objective 3 -- 7 artifacts; Objective 4 -- 9 artifacts; Objective 5 -- 4 artifacts; Objective 6 -- 9 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score was 52% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 54%; Objective 2 -- 60%; Objective 3 -- 59%; Objective 4 -- 56%; Objective 5 -- 48%; Objective 6 -- 54%; Objective 7 -- 49%; Objective 8 -- 45%).

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O2: Integrate social sciences**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O5: Communicate effectively**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 27/27; Objective 2 – 23/27; Objective 3 – 25/27; Objective 4 – 24/27; Objective 5 – 24/27; Objective 6 – 25/27. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 17/27; Objective 8 – 20/27).

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate. Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).

**Target for O2: Integrate social sciences**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate. Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).

**Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate. Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).

**Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate. Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).

**Target for O5: Communicate effectively**
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate. Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as "outstanding" or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients</th>
<th>4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate, Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as &quot;outstanding&quot; or &quot;more than satisfactory&quot; (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles</th>
<th>4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate, Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as &quot;outstanding&quot; or &quot;more than satisfactory&quot; (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs</th>
<th>4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2004 -- only 3 returned; not enough to evaluate, Class of 2006 -- Alumni generally rated their preparation for outcomes 1-6 as &quot;outstanding&quot; or &quot;more than satisfactory&quot; (Objective 1 – 6/6; Objective 2 – 6/6; Objective 3 – 6/6; Objective 4 – 5/6; Objective 5 – 6/6; Objective 6 – 6/6. Exiting students generally rated their preparation for outcomes 7-8 lower than their preparation for Outcomes 1-6 (Objective 7 – 4/6; Objective 8 – 4/6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit questionnaire</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of management principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively</td>
<td>Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients</td>
<td>Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social sciences</td>
<td>Utilize critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni survey</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of management principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively</td>
<td>Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients</td>
<td>Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social sciences</td>
<td>Utilize critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

Implement e-portfolio decisions
Undergraduate students have begun to put their artifacts and reflections into an electronic template developed in the division this past year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles

Implementation Description: April 2008 (full)
Responsible Person/Group: DPD Director (Dea Baxter)
Additional Resources: Graduate Research Assistant with computer expertise

Improve alumni evaluation return rate
Our return rate improved with the use of a self-addressed, stamped envelope. We will try to strengthen our email address records and use an electronic version of the survey.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni survey | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles

Implementation Description: April 2008
Responsible Person/Group: DPD Director (Dea Baxter)
Additional Resources: Current email addresses from the Alumni Association; computer expertise to develop/deliver survey

Strengthen Learning Outcome #7
We are relying on the expertise of a part-time instructor to teach this area. We anticipate 3-4 faculty retirements over the next 2-3 years and will focus on hiring a faculty member with this expertise during this time. In the meantime, we will continue working with the part-time instructor to strengthen critical areas.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: September 2009
Responsible Person/Group: DPD Director (Dea Baxter)
Additional Resources: Faculty expertise, as described above

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Student reflections continue to show strong achievement (confidence) in six of eight areas (communicate effectively, demonstrate science understanding, integrate social sciences, utilize critical thinking skills, demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle, demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients). Students reported higher achievement (confidence) in the health regulation area this year compared to last year. Students continue to report low achievement (confidence) in the application of management principles. These student perceptions were not supported by scores on the comprehensive examination, which were low.
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. While the student reflections were higher for the health regulations area this year, the test scores were not higher. The comprehensive exam is used to sensitize students to their strengths and weaknesses as they leave the program. It does not "count" toward a grade, affect their graduation status, or affect their verification statement award (required to complete internship). We will begin to focus on the management area as we replace retiring faculty members.

---
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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)

1.) 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.

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 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.

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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance on the Reasoned Analysis items average 1.7 on the Likert-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.6.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance on the Integration of Recommendations items average 1.85 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.8

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance on the Performance items average 1.8 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the three components were lower than 1.6.

M 4: Team Skills (O: 1, 2)
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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance on the Team Skills items average 1.9 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the two components were lower 1.8.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Student performance on the Team Skills items average 1.9 on the Liket-type scale that was used. This was just above the target of 1.5. None of the two components were lower 1.8.

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
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

Change Assessment Measures
Individual assessment Measures need to be broken out from the current multi-item Measures in use to allow individual analysis in findings and to further focus the action plan.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Emphasis on Quantitative Problem Solving
In both the electives and core courses, there will be an increase in the emphasis placed on the importance of the quantitative problem solving and the large number of possible applications of those techniques.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

More Emphasis on Human Elements in Operations
Increase the emphasis on the importance of the HR functions to the area of Operations Management. This will be done both in the elective classes and the core MBA class.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The students continue to show general strength in their ability to develop the structure of an organization from a macro point of view. They also have the ability to position the operations management function into the overall firm's competitive strategy. This is indicative of students who have job experience that required them to work within an organization. They are then capable of bringing that experience back into the classroom as evidenced in their project work. The students were able to apply analytical techniques to their chosen project's topic, particularly qualitative analytical techniques. The students understand the importance of performance implications of their firm's actions as they relate to operations management, and were able to relate them to both specific firms and industry.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Further emphasis needs to be placed on both integrating the human resources function into the operations area and increasing the emphasis on the importance of human resources to the operations management area. There needs to be an increase in the emphasis on being innovative when applying quantitative techniques to operations management and supply chain problems.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Organizational Change MS
As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 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: Change Management Theoretical Base (M: 1)
The ability to understand and identify the relevant change management theories that can influence an organization's reactions to change and the ability to analyze an organizational situation based on said theories.

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Change Management Intervention Assessment (M: 2)
The field of change management is action oriented and involves the use of specific interventions. The ability to understand, critique, and evaluate a specific change management intervention is an important learning outcome.

Institutional Priority Associations
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Change Management Intervention Post Mortem (M: 3)
The ability to critique a completed change management intervention and offer focused feedback to the focal group. Critiquing requires the student to integrate research with theory and practice, share feedback with a "real" client, evaluate the change management process and help the client assess the success of the intervention.

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: Theory Critique & Development (O: 1)
Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to the student's ability to conduct a post mortem analysis of a change management project. This project. 1. In the course of preparing and presenting an original change management model the student was able to demonstrate an awareness of the important theoretical underpinnings of current change management models. 2. In the course of describing the important features of an original change management model the student was able to highlight the attributes of his/her model as they relate to the theoretical underpinnings of established OD theories. 3. The students change management model is sufficiently comprehensive and understandable that it could be used in an organizational context.

Target for O1: Change Management Theoretical Base
We are expecting strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4.0 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being strong agreement with the above statements.

M 2: Intervention Assessment Critique (O: 2)

Faculty members will give a Likert-type scale rating and qualitative comments and recommendations on the following with respect to the student's ability to present, critique, and suggest applications for a specific OD intervention. 1. The student was able to understand and present the important features of a specific change management intervention. 2. The student provided sufficient depth and analysis in their description of the intervention that class participants could be expected to retain the important features of the intervention and be able to make a reasonable determination of appropriate situations where the stated change management intervention should and should not be used. Overall rating: 4.0 (5.0 = Strongly Agree)

M 3: Change Management Intervention Post Mortem Analysis (O: 3)

Faculty members will give a Yes or No rating on the following with respect to the student's ability to critique a real life OD intervention and capture strengths and weaknesses of the change management process with a real client. Each student will prepare a written assessment of a post-mortem analysis. As each project is very idiosyncratic, general guidelines must be used to assess each project. Scale ratings include: 1. The student was able to understand and present the important features of a specific change management project to assess its relative success. 2. The student was able to determine at least two factors that detracted from the success of the OD intervention. 3. The student was able to determine at least two factors that detracted from the success of the OD intervention and be able to make a reasonable determination of appropriate situations where the stated change management intervention should and should not be used. Rating Scale: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Target for O2: Change Management Intervention Assessment
We are expecting strong performance on the Likert Scale evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 4.0 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being strong agreement with the above statements.

Target for O3: Change Management Intervention Post Mortem
A large part of the change management process is the assessment and evaluation of change management activities. As such, each student is required to complete this evaluative assignment. This is a challenging assignment and one that requires collaboration outside the classroom with a third party and the ability to apply OD principles in a live setting combined with the ability to document the post-mortem process successfully. Initial levels of success are set to 75% Yes scores or higher on all measures.

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

Client Critique of Student Success
There is one specific assignment where collaboration with an outside party is required. When interfacing with change management users, assessment could be enhanced by asking the outside party to answer a brief series of questions regarding their experience with the change management student.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Change Management Intervention Post Mortem Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Change Management Intervention Post Mortem
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Organizational Behavior Faculty Members

Creating Useable Change Management Models

Students showed a slight underperformance in their ability to create change management models that were practical and useful in an organizational context. The change management program will need to place a greater emphasis on creating models of change that are sufficiently comprehensive and understandable such that the change management model could be used in an organizational context.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Theory Critique & Development | Outcome/Objective: Change Management Theoretical Base

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Organizational Behavior Faculty Members

Peer Critique

There are several places where critical thinking could be enhanced by peer critique of change management project work. The change management program could emphasize the importance and relevance of peer critique in both model building and intervention assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Intervention Assessment Critique | Outcome/Objective: Change Management Intervention Assessment
- Measure: Theory Critique & Development | Outcome/Objective: Change Management Theoretical Base

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Organizational Behavior Faculty Members

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The change management students were able to demonstrate mastery of the basic change management theories and interventions. In addition the students were relatively successful in generating their own change management models. The students were able to demonstrate their mastery through written and oral presentations. Their critical thinking abilities were high. The students were very homogenous in their understanding of the change management processes. When interacting with a change management end user the students were able to demonstrate their ability to apply their change management knowledge. Overall, the students were able to demonstrate mastery of the basic tenets of change management, although there were areas that could be improved.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The student generated models were not as user friendly as they could have been. There were several models that were lacking key ingredients essential to any change management model (the organization culture for example). At times the students were more passive consumers of OD information than active critiquers of theories and interventions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Personal Financial Planning MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: 1, 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
### SLO 4: Development & demonstration of professional skills (M: 1, 5, 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. Graduates will develop knowledge, skills, and desire to meet financial planning needs of future clients. Graduates will be able to perform individual financial analyses; analyze deficiencies between financial sources and needs, and recommend corrective actions; understand the changing environment of financial services, including new products, institutions, and markets; and pursue continued learning and professional development.

#### 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 professional standards and ethics (M: 1, 9)

Each MS-PFP student will demonstrate professionalism and integrity in professional practice through knowledge of the standards of professional 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 financial goal (M: 1, 9)

MS-PFP graduates will demonstrate the ability to compile and summarize financial data, to identify and quantify individual financial goals, 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: Develop and maintain an integrated financial plan (M: 9)

MS-PFP graduates will be able to demonstrate the ability to develop and maintain high-quality, integrated financial plans. 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: Explanation of technical concepts to clients (M: 9)

MS-PFP graduates will be able to communicate at a professional level and 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, 11)

MS-PFP graduates value the program.

**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. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
5. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### O/O 2: Awareness/participation in professional societies (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

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. 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. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
5. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### O/O 9: Program is relevant to employers (M: 2, 3, 11)

Employers find the program relevant to their needs and will hire our PFP graduates into quality positions within their firms.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4. External Relations
5. Recruitment

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Introductory Course (PFP 8400) (O: 3, 4, 5, 6)

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 O3: Use of professional/technical resources**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Student plans improved over this timeframe as the connections between the functional areas of financial planning, as well as those between the functional and behavioral areas, are better understood. Assessment 2: One hundred percent 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. Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. Assessment 3: One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective.

**Target for O4: Development & demonstration of professional skills**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Student plans improved over this timeframe as the connections between the functional areas of financial planning, as well as those between the functional and behavioral areas, are better understood. Assessment 2: One hundred percent 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. Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. Assessment 3: One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of professional standards and ethics**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis,
goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Student plans improved over this timeframe as the connections between the functional areas of financial planning, as well as those between the functional and behavioral areas, are better understood. Assessment 2: One hundred percent 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. Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. Assessment 3: One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Student plans improved over this timeframe as the connections between the functional areas of financial planning, as well as those between the functional and behavioral areas, are better understood. Assessment 2: One hundred percent 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. Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. Assessment 3: One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective.

**Target for O6: Formulate/communicate quantifiable financial goal**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent of students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan which emphasized financial analysis, goal achievement, and the taking of corrective actions. Student plans improved over this timeframe as the connections between the functional areas of financial planning, as well as those between the functional and behavioral areas, are better understood. Assessment 2: One hundred percent 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. Exam performance improved over this timeframe as students become more adept at recognizing key facts and performing relevant analyses. Assessment 3: One hundred percent of students in PFP participated in these discussions. Discussions improved over this timeframe with greater motivation to understand these issues from both a personal and professional perspective.

**M 2: Alumni Survey - PFP Competency (O: 1, 2, 9)**

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 through various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (Mean = 4.0) with the level of personal financial planning competency obtained through every course in the program, departmental and non-departmental. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies**

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained through various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (Mean = 4.0) with the level of personal financial planning competency obtained through every course in the program, departmental and non-departmental. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O9: Program is relevant to employers**

Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained through various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (Mean = 4.0) with the level of personal financial planning competency obtained through every course in the program, departmental and non-departmental. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 3: Alumni Survey - Career Preparation (O: 1, 2, 9)**

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.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni were satisfied (Mean = 3.5) with the extent to which the program has prepared them for and enhanced their career in personal financial planning. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni were satisfied (Mean = 3.5) with the extent to which the program has prepared them for and enhanced their career in personal financial planning. >>SURVEY RESULTS
Target for O9: Program is relevant to employers
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni were satisfied (Mean = 3.5) with the extent to which the program has prepared them for and enhanced their career in personal financial planning. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 4: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (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 a student’s level of satisfaction with multiple program attributes.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni were satisfied (Mean = 4.10) with all of the program attributes assessed.

Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies
Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Alumni were highly satisfied (Mean = 4.10) with all of the program attributes assessed.

M 5: Graduating Student Survey - PFP Competency (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
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.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction (Mean = 4.0 on RMI Department courses and Mean = 3.8 on all courses) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental and non-departmental courses. >>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 of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction (Mean = 4.0 on RMI Department courses and Mean = 3.8 on all courses) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental and non-departmental courses. >>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 of personal financial planning competency obtained across various courses.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction (Mean = 4.0 on RMI Department courses and Mean = 3.8 on all courses) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental and non-departmental courses. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Target for O4: Development & demonstration of professional skills
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students reported a high level of satisfaction (Mean = 4.0 on RMI Department courses and Mean = 3.8 on all courses) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental and non-departmental courses. >>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.
Graduating students will report satisfaction (a score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the extent 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.42) with the preparation the program has provided for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Graduating students will report satisfaction (a score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the extent 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.42) with the preparation the program has provided for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Graduating students will report satisfaction (a score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) in the extent 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.42) with the preparation the program has provided for a career in personal financial planning and the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities. >>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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students reported being satisfied (Mean = 3.88) with the various program attributes assessed, except "coverage of international topics" which fell slightly below average (Mean = 2.67). >>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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students reported being satisfied (Mean = 3.88) with the various program attributes assessed, except "coverage of international topics" which fell slightly below average (Mean = 2.67). >>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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Graduating students reported being satisfied (Mean = 3.88) with the various program attributes assessed, except "coverage of international topics" which fell slightly below average (Mean = 2.67). >>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 2 or 3 top-rated changes will be considered for implementation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating student would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni. >>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 2 or 3 top-rated changes will be considered for implementation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources
Graduating student would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni.
>>SURVEY RESULTS

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Graduating student would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni.
>>SURVEY RESULTS

M 9: PFP 8520 Capstone Course (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
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 once and 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 were 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 O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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 was required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. 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 was discussed in the class. 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 were measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Financial plans and exam performance remained at levels similar to past years. 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. 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. 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. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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 was required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. 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 was discussed in the class. 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 were measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Financial plans and exam performance remained at levels similar to past years. 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. 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. 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. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

Target for O4: Development & demonstration of professional skills
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
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 was required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. 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 was discussed in the class. 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 were measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Financial plans and exam performance remained at levels similar to past years. 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. 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. One hundred percent of students were active participants and questioners in the FPF 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize a particular aspect of financial planning practice management. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.

**Target for O8: Explanation of technical concepts to clients**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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 was required to provide substantive feedback immediately following the presentation. Role play exercises improved markedly compared to prior years. One reason might be the required feedback by non-participants. 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 was discussed in the class. 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 were measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. Financial plans and exam performance remained at levels similar to past years. 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. 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. 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. The speaker series remained highly successful due to a combination of competent speakers and students highly motivated to hear their insights.
similar to past years. 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.
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. 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. 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 (O: 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: Development & demonstration of professional skills

CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Relying on the best information available from CFP Board, I determined that 6 Georgia State students took the CFP® Exam
during this academic year. All six passed the exam. This 100 percent pass rate is significantly higher than the national pass
rate for first-time takers of about 60 percent.

M 11: Triennial PFP Program Review Panel (O: 1, 9)

A panel of not fewer than three financial planning professionals and at least one PFP program faculty member will evaluate the
graduate PFP programs at least once every three years. The Program Director, with the advice and approval of the RMI Department
Chair, will select the panel. The panel will be asked to determine the appropriateness of the program in meeting the needs of
students, employers, clients, and the general public. The panel will also assess the pedagogy and the academic rigor of the program.

Target for O1: Value to graduates

The Triennial Review Panel will report that the PFP programs are academically rigorous and are indeed meeting the needs of
their constituencies.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

This review team met at 11:00 a.m. on February 23, 2007, at the Robinson College of Business on the Georgia State
University downtown campus. The panel consisted of the following individuals: Annika Ferris, Atlanta-based financial planner
and alumnus; Glen Merritt, Atlanta-based financial planner and alumnus; Anthony Smith, Atlanta-based financial planner;
Karen Sutton, current MS-PFP student; Conrad Ciccotello, PFP programs director; and John Elger, PFP programs faculty. RMI
Department Chair Richard Phillips and Peggy Sherman (legal studies assistant professor) also attended at least portions of
the meeting. A summary of the panel’s key suggestions/observations follow: All panel members were very complementary of
the PFP programs, generally. Individualized placement efforts got special commendation and continued use of internship was
encouraged; need to continue to differentiate from other programs was emphasized. The most significant areas that the
panelists suggested for improvement included: 1. Use and knowledge of commercial PFP software (substantive, not practice
management/ability to model and graph with Excel. 2. Distribution planning in retirement (not just MDR). 3. Need for a PFP-
focused insurance planning course (RMI 8200, while providing good depth in the area of life insurance, is too focused on life
insurance and too focused on the insurer, rather than the insured). 4.More consideration of how best to protect against the
downside in investing (i.e. – substitutes for portfolio insurance). 5. Give more attention to executive compensation issues. 6.
Give more attention to compliance requirements and techniques.

Target for O9: Program is relevant to employers

The Triennial Review Panel will report that the PFP programs are academically rigorous and are indeed meeting the needs of
their constituencies.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

This review team met at 11:00 a.m. on February 23, 2007, at the Robinson College of Business on the Georgia State
University downtown campus. The panel consisted of the following individuals: Annika Ferris, Atlanta-based financial planner
and alumnus; Glen Merritt, Atlanta-based financial planner and alumnus; Anthony Smith, Atlanta-based financial planner;
Karen Sutton, current MS-PFP student; Conrad Ciccotello, PFP programs director; and John Elger, PFP programs faculty. RMI
Department Chair Richard Phillips and Peggy Sherman (legal studies assistant professor) also attended at least portions of
the meeting. A summary of the panel’s key suggestions/observations follow: All panel members were very complementary of
the PFP programs, generally. Individualized placement efforts got special commendation and continued use of internship was
encouraged; need to continue to differentiate from other programs was emphasized. The most significant areas that the
panelists suggested for improvement included: 1. Use and knowledge of commercial PFP software (substantive, not practice
management/ability to model and graph with Excel. 2. Distribution planning in retirement (not just MDR). 3. Need for a PFP-
focused insurance planning course (RMI 8200, while providing good depth in the area of life insurance, is too focused on life
insurance and too focused on the insurer, rather than the insured). 4.More consideration of how best to protect against the
downside in investing (i.e. – substitutes for portfolio insurance). 5. Give more attention to executive compensation issues. 6.
Give more attention to compliance requirements and techniques.

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.

Revised investment course options
Continue development and implementation of a PFP-specific investment planning course

Potential new PFP courses
The current coursework on insurance planning is narrowly focused in life insurance and strongly oriented toward product design. One of our goals is to develop a course that would cover a broader range of insurance planning topics, with overarching themes such as the overall economics of risk and efficient use of contracts and markets to trade in risk. Presently, we are incubating such a course as RMI 8220. Another potential area of revision is the investment planning curriculum. The current coursework is offered by the Department of Finance and does not have a strong planning orientation. We would like to develop a course specifically tailored to planning, which would use life-cycle theory as an underpinning for case based investment planning studies. Such a course would be developed and taught under a PFP or RMI title.

Revise curriculum (Review Panel suggestions)
PFP faculty and RMI Department Chair will consider revising the existing PFP curriculum to reflect the following suggestions made by the Review Panel: 1. Use and knowledge of commercial PFP software (substantive, not practice management)ability to model and graph with Excel. 2. Distribution planning in retirement (not just MDR). 3. Need for a PFP-focused insurance planning course (RMI 8200, while providing good depth in the area of life insurance, is too focused on life insurance and too focused on the insurer, rather than the insured). 4. More consideration of how best to protect against the downside in investing (i.e. – substitutes for portfolio insurance). 5. Give more attention to executive compensation issues. 6. Give more attention to compliance requirements and techniques.

Suggested program changes
Survey results revealed that graduating students would like to see additional emphasis on job placement and increased activities for alumni. The PFP Program Director will work with the Department’s Director of Student and External Affairs to address these needs.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
During the 2006-07 year, we made some progress on the development and implementation of a PFP-specific investment planning course. Discussions with Professor Craig Ruff of the Finance Department revealed a joint interest in the project. Implementation remains a difficult challenge given current staffing constraints. The program made significant progress on items related to graduating student comments from the prior year. The PFP Student Alumni Club has been very active, and now invites financial planning students from other CFP board registered programs to its quarterly meetings. Efforts to bring together job seekers with PFP firms have also been improved. Job opportunities are now communicated via the PFP Student Alumni network electronically. Additional
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Two areas of the curriculum have been identified as needing improvement. One is the insurance planning area, where the current coursework is narrowly focused on life insurance and strongly oriented toward product design. A goal would be to move toward a course that covers a broader range of insurance planning topics, with the overall economics of risk and efficient use of contracts and markets to trade in risk as overarching themes. At present, we are incubating such as course as RMI 8220. The second area is the investment planning curriculum. The current coursework is offered by the department of finance and does not have a strong planning orientation. A course tailored to planning, which would use life-cycle theory as an underpinning for case based investment planning studies is the goal. Such a course would be developed and taught under a PFP or RMI title.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Philosophy BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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 GSUs 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: 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
2 Written Communication--core
4 Oral Communication--core
8 Critical Thinking--core

SLO 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals (M: 2, 3, 6)
(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
4 Oral Communication--core
8 Critical Thinking--core

SLO 3: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content (M: 2, 4, 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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Writing ability (O: 1)

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 O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in writing ability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

As this measure relates to Phil 1010 Learning, 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 2.62.

M 2: Philosophical skills (O: 1, 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 collect 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 O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals

Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. 4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in philosophical skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

This measure concerns all 3 of our Outcomes. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, 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 2.6. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 2.85. Finally, as this pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals, senior majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average grade of 3.02 for philosophical skills.

Target for O2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals

Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. 4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in philosophical skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

This measure concerns all 3 of our Outcomes. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, 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 2.6. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 2.85. Finally, as this pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals, senior majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average grade of 3.02 for philosophical skills.

Target for O3: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content

Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills. 4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in philosophical skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

This measure concerns all 3 of our Outcomes. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, 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 2.6. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 2.85. Finally, as this pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals, senior majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average grade of 3.02 for philosophical skills.
2.85. Finally, as this pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals, senior majors in any 4000 level philosophy class submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average grade of 3.02 for philosophical skills.

### Target for O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Goals
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As this measure pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, 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 who gave them an average grade of 2.94 for the ability to apply what they learned. As this measure also pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 2.88.

### Target for O2: PHIL 2010 Learning Goals
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills. Papers of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 who gave them an average grade of 2.94 for the ability to apply what they learned. As this measure also pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, 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 2.88.

### Target for O3: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in communication skills.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This measure pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals. Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation according to Measures 2 and 4. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a grade isolating their communication skills. The average grade the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.12.

### Target for O4: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in collaboration skills.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This measure pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals. Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation according to Measures 2 and 4. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a grade isolating their collaborative abilities. The average grade the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.16.

### Target for O5: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in collaboration skills.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This measure pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals. Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation according to Measures 2 and 4. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a grade isolating their collaborative abilities. The average grade the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.16.

### Target for O6: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content
Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in content knowledge.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
This measure pertains to the Phil BA Learning Goals. Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We collect these and, using a random number generator, chose 20 to have 3 Assessment Committee members score for content knowledge.

### Source of Evidence:
- Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Phil 10

After discussion, the faculty decided no curricular changes were warranted at this time for Phil 10. 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: Philosophical skills | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 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

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

Redesign of Phil 1010

Last year, the Department decided to do a complete redesign of the 1010 curriculum, focusing the course 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...
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 GSUs 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. Thus, it is very important that we emphasize students' ability to acquire philosophical skills which are applicable to whatever occupation or field they enter after graduation. To this end for continuous improvement of student learning, we will focus on getting the average rating for skills up to the level students are achieving for content knowledge. In an effort to continuously improve student learning, we will attempt to increase our emphasis on content knowledge and philosophical skills in the 2010 sections. Finally, our majors' average on content significantly exceeded the majors' average rating for skills. While it is natural that majors would perform best on content knowledge of their subject, it is also true that students who graduate with a major in philosophy go into all kinds of careers. Thus, it is very important that we emphasize students' ability to acquire philosophical skills which are applicable to whatever occupation or field they enter after graduation. To this end for continuous improvement of student learning, we will focus on getting the average rating for skills up to the level students are achieving for content knowledge.

**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 satisfied with the performance of students in Phil 1010, Phil 2010, and with senior majors (BA students). While there is and always will be room for improvement, the Department feels that, in general, the data demonstrates that the students are attaining the learning goals. The randomly collected data show no grades below D-. All the students who turned in materials were performing satisfactorily.

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

There is room for improvement. As can be seen in the "Action Plan," the Department feels that we can directly improve the 1010 course; we are in the process of doing so. We hope that this will help improve not only the student learning in 1010, but also--because of that improved preparation--the ability of students to perform well in all of their classes and thus to progress to graduation more steadily. Since our goal is continuous improvement, we also hope that this will enable us to raise our targets and have students demonstrate those increased levels of learning. In addition, our findings with 2010 students was that their application skills exceeded their content knowledge and philosophical skills. While it is certainly a goal to have the students apply what they have learned, it is also the case that if their philosophical skills and content knowledge increased, what they can apply would also increase. Therefore, in an effort to continuously improve student learning, we will attempt to increase our emphasis on content knowledge and philosophical skills in the 2010 sections. Finally, our majors' average on content significantly exceeded the majors' average rating for skills. While it is natural that majors would perform best on content knowledge of their subject, it is also true that students who graduate with a major in philosophy go into all kinds of careers. Thus, it is very important that we emphasize students' ability to acquire philosophical skills which are applicable to whatever occupation or field they enter after graduation. To this end for continuous improvement of student learning, we will focus on getting the average rating for skills up to the level students are achieving for content knowledge.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Philosophy MA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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 GSUs 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content (M: 1, 2)**

Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain 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/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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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 Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content

MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in philosophical skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

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 3.28.

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 Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content

MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in content knowledge.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

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 3.48.

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
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. All students that attempted to defend an MA thesis succeeded and 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?

We believe we should largely continue as we are.
### Mission / Purpose

In accordance with, and in support of, the mission of Georgia State University, the purpose of the Division of Physical Therapy is to prepare doctors of physical therapy who are committed to clinical excellence, professional distinction, and the pursuit of scholarly activities that contribute to the body of scientific and clinical knowledge. Note: 99 graduate students are enrolled in the program, and 39 graduated in May 2007.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate compassion, caring, and empathy in providing serves to patients/clients.</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.10) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (4.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate professional behaviors in all interactions with patients/clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.11) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (6.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates identify, respect, and act with consideration for patients’/clients’ differences, values, preferences, and expressed needs in all professional activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.18) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate a systematic process for clinical judgement and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning.</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates effectively educate others using culturally appropriate teaching methods that are commensurate with the needs of the learner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.26) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (10.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Patient/Client Management Expectation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate competency in the five elements of care including examination, evaluation, diagnosis, prognosis, and intervention for patients across the lifespan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.28 through CC-5.44) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SLO 12: Practice Management Expectation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Graduates will demonstrate competence in determining a plan of care that is acceptable, realistic, culturally competent, and patient/client-centered.

Relevant Associations: CAPTE standard, 2006 (CC-5.53 through 56) Normative Model of Physical Therapist Professional Education 2004 (10.1)

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of first-year DPT students scored 63% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. 53% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. After their remediation, all third-year MPT students scored 80% or higher on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive exam.

**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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - 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: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - 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 WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - 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 WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

**Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication**

This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEnline 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

3rd year MPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Ten oral platform presentations occurred on December 8, 2006 in the Speakers Auditorium of the Student Center. Posters of the research were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia on April 14, 2007. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%.Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.
level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectation: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%. Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18: Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%. Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22: Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.
scorated at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%.
Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%.
Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18:
Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% at 95%.
Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%.
Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%.
Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22:
Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007:

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Students graduating in May 2007 scored at entry-level (100%) or entry-level with distinction (at a post-graduate level) on measures related to treatment intervention (#14), and education (#15). Criterion #10: Screening, 92% were scored at entry-level or above, and 14% were scored at 95%. Criterion #11: Examination: 97% were scored at entry-level or above and 3% were scored at 95%. Criterion #12: Evaluation/Diagnosis/Prognosis, 94% were scored at entry-level or above and 6% were scored at 95% or higher. Criterion #13: Plan of Care, 97% were scored at entry-level or higher and 3% were scored at 95%.
Criterion #16: Quality of Service Delivery, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 95% and 3% at 85%.
Criterion #17: Consultation, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. Criterion #18:
Management of Patient Services, 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% were scored at 90% and 3% were scored at 85%. Criterion #19: Resource Management, 86% were scored at entry-level or higher, 11% at 95%, and 3% at 85%. Criterion #20: Fiscal Management, 88% were scored at entry-level or higher, 6% at 95% and 3% 90%.
Criterion #21: Support Personnel: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher, 3% at 95%, and 3% at 90%. Criterion #22:
Professional/Social Responsibilities: 94% were scored at entry-level or higher and 6% at 90%. In each case, where a student was rated by their Clinical Instructor as below entry-level (i.e. in the 85th, 90th or 95th percentiles), the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education contacted the CI to discuss the finding. In each case, the CI reported that the student was performing at entry-level, however they rated the student as they did based on room for improvement. Data for the first and second year DPT students will be available in August 2007.

### 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.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sent. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

### 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
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sed. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectationsof the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sed. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2006 graduates was not captured, hence the survey to employers was not sed. However, in place of that, 89 surveys were sent to clinical instructors. 43 surveys were returned (48% return rate). 95% reported that GSU students were academically prepared and adhered to the professional expectations of the facility, were able to perform required skills, and 94% reported that GSU students possessed the characteristics and knowledge based expected for an entry-level student.

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 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
Data are not available at this time. May 2007 graduates will begin taking the national licensure examination in June, 2007.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Data have not been collected.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Data have not been collected.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
Data have not been collected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data have not been collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>M 8: Professional Behaviors (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Clinical Performance Instrument for the Physical Therapist Student, (questions 1-5) developed by the American Physical Therapy Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students graduating in May 2007, (n=36) scored 5/5 on all five comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors (safety, presents self professionally, interaction with others, ethical practice, legal practice). Data are not yet available for the first and second year DPT students. The data from these upcoming clinical experiences will be available in August, 2007.
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.

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

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

- Measure: Comprehensive Examinations
- 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

**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 state physical therapy meeting. In order to increase the visibility of the student-focused research program at Georgia State, we propose that 50% of student research groups, with their faculty adviser, will submit their research for peer-reviewed presentation at a
Identify employers of 2007 graduates

Keep spreadsheet of employers for 2007 graduates and mail survey in November 2007.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Employer Survey | 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: Cultural Competence | Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice | Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty | Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

Implementation Description: November 2007
Responsible Person/Group: ACCE and Division Head

Initiate remediation - Comprehensive Exam

Based on student feedback, the yearly comprehensive examinations appear to be a useful tool in assessing overall mastery of information learned to date as well as a preparation for taking the licensure examination. Last year, however, only the 3rd-year students engaged in remediation of examinations if they scored below the established standard. Beginning June 2007, every student who falls below the target score will engage in a reflexive self-assessment exercise. Each student will provide a summary statement for each question missed, including documentation of corresponding evidence as to why their first choice is incorrect and why their new choice is correct.

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

Clarify grading for Clinical Instructors

Continued from 2005-06. CAPTE, the accrediting body of physical therapy programs, recommends use of the Clinical Performance Inventory (CPI) for evaluation of students in clinical settings. Prior to graduation, all students are to achieve the "entry-level" status on all 24 measures. The grading scale is a 10cm likert scale, and entry-level is 100%, requiring a mark at the end of the line. Improvements were noted in grading, however there remained several examples of CIs who verbally reported the student was performing at entry-level, however was scored on the 85% to 95% range.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Clinical competence | 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: August 2007
Responsible Person/Group: ACCE and Division Head

Identify employers of 2007 graduates

Keep spreadsheet of employers for 2007 graduates and mail survey in November 2007.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Employer Survey | 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: November 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Division Head

Initiate remediation - Comprehensive Exam

Based on students’ feedback, the yearly comprehensive examinations appear to be a useful tool in assessing overall mastery of information learned to date as well as a preparation for taking the licensure examination. Last year, however, only the 3rd-year students engaged in remediation of examinations if they scored below the established standard. Beginning June 2007, every student who falls below the target score will engage in a reflexive self-assessment exercise. Each student will provide a summary statement for each question missed, including documentation of corresponding evidence as to why their first choice is incorrect and why their new choice is correct.

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

Clarify grading for Clinical Instructors

Continued from 2005-06. CAPTE, the accrediting body of physical therapy programs, recommends use of the Clinical Performance Inventory (CPI) for evaluation of students in clinical settings. Prior to graduation, all students are to achieve the "entry-level" status on all 24 measures. The grading scale is a 10cm likert scale, and entry-level is 100%, requiring a mark at the end of the line. Improvements were noted in grading, however there remained several examples of CIs who verbally reported the student was performing at entry-level, however was scored on the 85% to 95% range.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Clinical competence | 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: August 2007
Responsible Person/Group: ACCE and Division Head

Identify employers of 2007 graduates

Keep spreadsheet of employers for 2007 graduates and mail survey in November 2007.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Employer Survey | 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: November 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Division Head

Initiate remediation - Comprehensive Exam

Based on students’ feedback, the yearly comprehensive examinations appear to be a useful tool in assessing overall mastery of information learned to date as well as a preparation for taking the licensure examination. Last year, however, only the 3rd-year students engaged in remediation of examinations if they scored below the established standard. Beginning June 2007, every student who falls below the target score will engage in a reflexive self-assessment exercise. Each student will provide a summary statement for each question missed, including documentation of corresponding evidence as to why their first choice is incorrect and why their new choice is correct.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Examinations | 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

Implementation Description: June 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Student Promotion and Retention & Curriculum Committees

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Improved outcomes were noted in the professional practice outcomes. Visibility of original student-faculty research was enhanced through the presentation of posters at a State meeting for physical therapists. 4 student-groups presented at a National meeting.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Assessing clinical competence through the use of the Clinical Performance Inventory (CPI) will continue to require ongoing dialogue with clinical instructors and clinical instructor training. Comprehensive examinations will be modified so that self-assessment of performance can continue after each of the three examinations.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2006-2007 Physics BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:44 PM EST

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

#### 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.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 5, 6)**

Students collaborate effectively with other students.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Collaboration—major

**SLO 2: Contemporary Issues (M: 6)**

Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

9 Contemporary Issues—major

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking: Research Questions (M: 5, 6)**

Students develop research questions appropriate for research.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking—major

**SLO 4: Critical Thinking: Data Collection (M: 5, 6)**

Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking—major

**SLO 5: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis (M: 5, 6)**
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 7 Critical Thinking--major |

**SLO 6: Critical Thinking: Future Research (M: 5, 6)**

Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 7 Critical Thinking--major |

**SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 6)**

Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 3 Oral Communication--major |

**SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 5, 6)**

Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 1 Written Communication--major |

**SLO 9: Core Knowledge Content (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate a knowledge of core principles in modern physics, statistical and thermal physics, classical mechanics, and electricity and magnetism.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 11 Quantitative Skills--major |

**SLO 10: Application of Knowledge (M: 1)**

Students effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems, using ordinary and partial differential equations and vector calculus where appropriate.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 11 Quantitative Skills--major |

**SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 5, 6)**

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).
Target for O9: Core Knowledge Content
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Six to nine students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 4.1 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Six to nine students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 4.1 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed physics courses. Based on data from 155 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 54%. Based on data from 184 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 48%. Based on data from 153 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 55%. Based on data from 92 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 71%.

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 2006-2007 - 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 27 students in Phys1111, the average score on the five quiz questions was 63%. Based on data from 17 students in Phys1112, the average score on the five quiz questions was 75%. Based on data from 12 students in Phys2211, the average score on the five quiz questions was 72%. Based on data from 10 students in Phys2212, the average score on the five quiz questions was 74%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from 280 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 48%. Based on data from 311 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 59%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O8: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Five 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Six 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

Target for O1: Collaboration

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Six 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.3 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Six 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 3.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.7 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
- Objective: Oral Communication | Written Communication
Critical Thinking in Gen Ed Review

The Departmental Assessment Committee will meet and review the results from the previous two years. They will discuss ways to address the few areas in which targets were not met for Critical Thinking in General Education courses. Among the possible actions discussed will be 1) changes in measurement tools, 2) changes in implementation of measurement tools, and 3) curriculum changes to improve instruction in critical thinking. Particular attention will be paid to measures in Phys1112 and Astr1010 since targets have not been met for two consecutive years, although targets were not missed by very much.

Department Curriculum Review

In preparation for introducing new or modified courses in accordance with the Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) initiative, a department curriculum review will be performed. Since the curriculum changes will impact the courses involved in the learning outcome assessment of the Physics B.S., the new or modified courses will be designed with the program’s learning outcomes as a prime consideration. The curriculum review committee will be provided with the learning outcome assessment results for the last two years. The instructors of the courses currently used in the assessment will be consulted if not already involved in the curriculum review. Committee will be formed during Summer 2007 and must submit curriculum changes to the college committee by September 2008.

Engage Faculty

A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last two years of assessment of learning outcomes in the Physics B.S. program will be discussed. The faculty will receive copies of the assessment report and discuss the performance of the program for each outcome.

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 (2006/2007 academic year), 7 students received B.S. degrees in Physics. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point (core courses (6-9), junior labs (5), and senior research(6)), accurate measures of student learning outcomes will required averaging over several years. Overall targets were generally met and in the few occurrence where they were not met, the assessments were only slightly below the targets. Critical Thinking in General Education targets have been generally met over the last two years.
Outcomes 10, Application of Knowledge, was slightly below target value for both of the years the assessment has been performed as revealed by ratings of instructors in core courses taken by majors in their junior and senior year. This outcome involves students ability to use the physics knowledge and the math skills they have learned to perform problem-solving. Special attention will be focused on this area during the departmental curriculum review to be performed in the coming year. Critical Thinking Assessment targets were not met (although very close) either of the two years for Phys1112 and Astr1010. Specific attention will be required from the Department Assessment Committee to determine if the measures are not appropriate, not implemented appropriately, or if curriculum changes are needed in those courses to address the instruction of critical thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 1, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Formulate Research Questions (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students develop research questions appropriate for research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Data Collection (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Data Analysis (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Future Research (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 1, 3, 4, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or colloquium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 1, 4, 5, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles (M: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Math Skills and Application (M: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 1, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12: Specialized Equipment (M: 1, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) was rated by their research advisors. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 5.0 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, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) was rated by their research advisors. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 5.0 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, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O8: Written Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) was rated by their research advisors. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 5.0 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, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O11: Computer Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) was rated by their research advisors. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 5.0 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, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O12: Specialized Equipment**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) was rated by their research advisors. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 5.0 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, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**M 2: 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.

**Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Three 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 - 4.7 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Three 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.7 out of 5.0.

**M 3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Data Collection**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Future Research**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 9 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 - 4.4 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 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.

M 4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

Target for O7: Oral Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

Target for O8: Written Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

Target for O11: Computer Skills

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.
Target for **O12: Specialized Equipment**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 3.0 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 - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

**M 5: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 10 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**M 6: Astronomy Thesis Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10)**

In the thesis and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the thesis, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.

Target for **O4: Data Collection**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.
Target for **O5**: Data Analysis

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.

Target for **O6**: Future Research

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.

Target for **O7**: Oral Communication

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

One M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration student (thesis option) was rated by his/her research advisor and committee (3 assessments completed) based on his/her oral presentation and thesis defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Oral Communication - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**M7: Astronomy Thesis or 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two M.S. in Physics with Astronomy concentration students (1 non-thesis option and 1 thesis option) were rated by their committee and advisor based on their thesis or research paper. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.
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.

**SLO 5: Written Communication (M: 1, 3)**
Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.

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

### Engage Faculty
A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last two years of assessment of learning outcomes in the Physics M.S. program will be discussed. The faculty will receive copies of the assessment report and discuss the performance of the program for each outcome.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Astronomy Adviser | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration
- **Measure:** Astronomy Qualifying Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Math Skills and Application
- **Measure:** Astronomy Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Data Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Data Collection | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Formulate Research Questions | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Future Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Math Skills and Application
- **Measure:** Written Communication
- **Measure:** Physics Advisor | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration
- **Measure:** Physics Committee General Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Physics Committee Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Physics Research Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Oral Communication | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Specialized Equipment | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
- **Measure:** Written Communication

### Implementation Description:
September 30, 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Chairman Dick Miller and Departmental Assessment Committee
### SLO 6: Core Physics Principles (M: 1, 2, 4)
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.

### SLO 7: Math Skills and Application (M: 1, 2, 4)
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 8: Computer Skills (M: 3)
Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.

### SLO 9: Specialized Research Equipment (M: 3)
Students effectively use appropriate specialized equipment for experimental or theoretical research.

### SLO 10: Collaboration (M: 3)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

### SLO 11: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 1, 2)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

### SLO 12: Formulate Research Questions (M: 1, 2)
Students develop research questions appropriate for research.

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Data Analysis**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 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 - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Written Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 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 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation document and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Oral Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Core Physics Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Math Skills and Application**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Formulate Research Questions**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (8 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based on the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.3 out of 5.0.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their research advisor after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Written Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their research advisor after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O8: Computer Skills**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their research advisor after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O9: Specialized Research Equipment**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their research advisor after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Two Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their research advisor after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 1, Collaboration - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 6, 7)**

Students take a number of required courses during their first three semesters that cover the physics and math content for their particular area of research. Following their third semester they take a Qualifying Examination (Q-exam) in the areas applicable to their area of 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 O6: Core Physics Principles**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Eight 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Eight 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 - 4.3 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

Engage Faculty
A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last two years of assessment of learning outcomes in the Physics Ph.D. program will be discussed. The faculty will receive copies of the assessment report and discuss the performance of the program for each outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Committee Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Data Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Data Collection | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Formulate Research Questions | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Future Research Questions | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Mathematics Skills and Application | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Motivations and Implications of Research | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Measure: Oral Communication | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles

Implementation Description: September 30, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chairman Dick Miller and Department Assessment Committee

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 (2006/2007 academic year), 2 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 required averaging over several years. The Physics Ph.D. program shows strength across the board in the areas assessed. None of the learning outcomes fell below target values in 2005/2006 and only one area fell below in 2006/2007. Particular strength was measured in areas of data analysis and computer skills.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The only area which fell below departmental targets was Motivations and Implications of Research and Future Research, although it was very near the target level. This outcome will receive particular attention at the planned faculty meeting.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Political Science BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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

**SLO 3: Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives (M: 3)**
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.

**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
- 1.5 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
- 3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Analytical Skills--Distinguishing Behaviors (M: 4)**
Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

**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
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Analytical Skills--Appropriate Use of Evidence (M: 5)**
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.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Critical Thinking--major
9 Contemporary Issues--major
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 6: Effective Communication (M: 6)

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 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
3 Oral Communication--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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
POLS 1101 (American Government and Politics): Results Goal IV 1: Diverse Perspectives Percent Passing: Question #2 92% Question #4 95% Question #9 81% Question #37 88% Question #39 76% Question #46 65%. POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Results Goal IV 1: Percent passing: Question #25 competing theories of international trade 88% Question #26 competing views of mercantilism 89% Question #27 competing theories of international trade 84% Question #29 competing theories of development 92% Question #30 competing theories of development 86% Results Goal IV 2a: Question #7 on the Muslim world 89% Question #8 on the Muslim world and US 89% 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 PoIS 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 2006-2007 - 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 substantive knowledge 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 2006-2007 - 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 issues 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’s choice and 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 2006-2007 - 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 from 2004-05 with 95 papers submitted out of 107 graduating political science majors in the 2005-06 academic year as compared to 81 responses out of 107 graduating political science majors in the 2004-05 academic year. However, the response rate dropped this year to 42 out of 137 majors. In addition, there still is an unwanted degree of variation in quality as related to these skills. Part of this is to be expected as we are one department in a large state University with significant variation in student ability and aptitude. In addition, just as in previous years, 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 had 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
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. The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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.

**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 study abroad programs, and similar programs. These are very popular with our political science majors and the Department has enjoyed considerable 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 2006-2007 - 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 specific assignments and through class participation.

**Target for O6: Effective Communication**

The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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 PoS 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Approximately 95% of Political Science majors taking the mandatory POLS 3800 Research Methods course pass with a grade higher than D, while 62 percent receive a grade of C or higher. 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 PoS 3800, and in 2005-06 only 8 out of 95 used numerical data, and only one paper was submitted from POLS 3880, while in 2006-2007 4 papers out of 42 were from PoS 3880. However, it should be noted that in the Department sponsored an Undergraduate Research Day and 12 entries were papers initially written for PoS 3880 and the paper that won the top prize as the Best Paper was a paper written for PoS 3880 and the same paper was selected for presentation for the University wide Undergraduate Research Day. However, in continued improvement from the first year of collection 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.
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 skill 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

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: 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: 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.
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 the past two years, and as is part of the Departmental self-study, the Department’s goal 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 skill 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: 2006-2007
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: Methodological Skills | Outcome/Objective: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major

Implementation Description: September 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair

Research Skills
The Department seeks to enhance and encourage research skills of the majors so that they learn, through “hands on” research experience how to formulate at thesis, gather evidence and data, analyze said data and evidence and form conclusions as to the merit of the thesis. To facilitate this, the Department, as part of the RPG for 2006-2007, was awarded funding to establish an Undergraduate Research Day. Over 32 papers were submitted and 12 finalists were selected. The Department, under the RPG for 2007-2008 was awarded funding to continue the project. The Department seeks to increase submissions to 50% of all majors.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Analyzing Contemporary Issues | Outcome/Objective: Analyzing Contemporary Issues
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: January 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair

Student Retention
The Department is committed to retention of majors and seeing that all graduate within a maximum of 6 years from beginning of college. To facilitate retention, under the Department’s successful RPG proposal for 2006-2007, an undergraduate committee was established to coordinate advising of the over 600 majors by all faculty, Tenured, tenure track and instructors. Faculty met students during the fall and spring during registration for the coming semester. The Department received another RPG grant for 2007-2008 to continue the committee and advise for the 2007-2008 period. Approximately 30% of majors took advantage of the advisement process and feedback was uniformly positive. The Department seeks to continue this process for the foreseeable future.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
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—Structures and Processes | Outcome/Objective: Substantive Knowledge—Structures and Processes

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies/Chair

Supplemental Instruction
All large (i.e., more than 120 students) sections of POLS 1101 American Government and POLS 2401 Global Issues should continue to have the assistance of Supplemental Instruction leaders. SI leaders (as initially planned for under the Department’s successful RPG proposal for 2006-07, and planned for again under Department’s successful RPG proposal for 2007-2008) have and can continue to facilitate student involvement, learning, and success.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analytical Skills—Appropriate Use of Evidence | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills—Appropriate Use of Evidence
### 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:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We believe that both the core curriculum – PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 and the upper division courses are essential tools in educating GSU students to be active and aware American and global citizens and are a proven strength of the department. Multiple sources of data from our three years of assessment outcomes 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. The use of Supplemental Instructors has been a significant positive step in assisting students, and feedback from students indicates significant support and appreciation of these Supplemental Instructors. In addition, our specific analysis of PolS 3800 and surveys of our other major courses indicates that we are achieving desired learning outcomes in our upper division courses. Based on feedback during our initial advising and evaluations, students react positively to the teaching and learning in these courses. Students pass PolS 3800 at a 94% rate, an increase over past years, and major credit is garnered in over 80% of these classes, indicating progress in teaching students in the one mandatory course for all students. Evaluations of instructors remain very high in all classes, including 3800. The Undergraduate Research Day submissions were of high quality indicating that students are learning and mastering the use of research skills, both quantitative and qualitative. Our experiential learning programs continue to thrive and contribute to student learning. Moot Court, the Model Arab League and Model UN continue to have high rates of participation and enjoy considerable success in terms of competitions with other institutions. These experiences play a significant role in our training of undergraduate students for future careers in law, diplomacy, and international business. Finally, the Department’s graduates continue to enjoy significant success in graduate, law and business placement.

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

Student advisement and subsequent efforts to assist learning through retention continue to require 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 2002 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. Hours per section remained the highest of any department in the college. 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

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Student advisement and subsequent efforts to assist learning through retention continue to require 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 2002 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. Hours per section remained the highest of any department in the college. 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 objectives.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Eighteen students completed the requirements for the MA in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (including summer). Twelve opted for the non-thesis, six for the thesis. Eleven completed the thesis or non-thesis requirements in Fall 2006, six in Spring 2007, and one in summer 2006. Six of the MA projects were written in the field of American Politics and twelve 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 are provided below. Results for theses and non-thesis papers are broken out separately this year. Ratings indicate the average of ratings given by committee members on a scale of 1-5, with 1 indicating learning goals met to a ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating goals met to a ‘very high degree’. Theses (n=6) To what degree does the thesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.4 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.5 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student’s area of specialization? a. ability to formulate research questions Ave. rating: 4.4 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 4.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 4.3 Selected open-ended comments on theses: “I expect this paper will be publishable in its final form.” “...Well focused, using the existing literature and using both statistical and case study research techniques.” “This is a very strong thesis that effectively addressed a compelling research question that has both theoretical and policy implications going well beyond the particular cases studied.” “A very convincing and well-executed paper that, with some revisions, should be publishable in a good policy journal.” “...An ambitious project that the candidate approached seriously and professionally.” “...A fine thesis that was well-researched, beautifully written, and added to the existing literature. With revisions, it may well be publishable.” “...One of the two best Master's theses I've read while I've been at Georgia State (15 years)." Summary data for the twelve non-thesis papers are presented below (Scale 1 to 5, with 1 indicating ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating ‘very high
degree.’) Non-thesis papers (n=12) To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.6 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate the ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.5 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 3.2 Selected open-ended comments on non-thesis papers: “[Student] did a good job conceptualizing a research project based on mostly theory, formulated testable hypotheses and used data effectively to assess them. This nnonthesis paper was as strong as many theses I’ve seen.” “This nonthesis paper just barely reached the minimum standard. It offered well-reasoned policy prescriptions, but fell short in failing to offer a robust analytical framework to address the question." “More extensive analysis of the cases and better application of the theories outlined in the first half of the paper would have strengthened this paper.” “Outstanding non-thesis paper that meets learning goals to a very high degree.” “Shows a strong grasp of the literature and provides two detailed case studies.” “The paper’s strengths were a wealth of information on the cases and an interesting research question.”

Target for O2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate mastery of the program’s stated learning objectives.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Eighteen students completed the requirements for the MA in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (including summer). Twelve opted for the non-thesis, six for the thesis. Eleven completed the thesis or non-thesis requirements in Fall 2006, six in Spring 2007, and one in summer 2006. Six of the MA projects were written in the field of American Politics and twelve 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 are provided below. Results for theses and non-thesis papers are broken out separately this year. Ratings indicate the average of ratings given by committee members on a scale of 1-5, with 1 indicating learning goals met to a ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating goals met to a ‘very high degree’. Theses (n=6) To what degree does the thesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.4 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.5 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 4.6 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 4.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 4.3. Selected open-ended comments on theses: "I expect this paper will be publishable in its final form." "Well focused, using the existing literature and using both statistical and case study research techniques." "This is a very strong thesis that effectively addressed a compelling research question that has both theoretical and policy implications going well beyond the particular cases studied.” "A very convincing and well-executed paper that, with some revisions, should be publishable in a good policy journal.” “An ambitious project that the candidate approached seriously and professionally.” “A fine thesis that was well-researched, beautifully written, and added to the existing literature. With revisions, it may well be publishable.” "...One of the two best Master's theses I've read while I've been at Georgia State (15 years)." Summary data for the twelve non-thesis papers are presented below (Scale 1 to 5, with 1 indicating ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating ‘very high degree’). Non-thesis papers (n=12) To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 a. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.6 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 3.2 Selected open-ended comments on non-thesis papers: “[Student] did a good job conceptualizing a research project based on mostly theory, formulated testable hypotheses and used data effectively to assess them. This nonthesis paper was as strong as many theses I've seen.” “This nonthesis paper just barely reached the minimum standard. It offered well-reasoned policy prescriptions, but fell short in failing to offer a robust analytical framework to address the question." "More extensive analysis of the cases and better application of the theories outlined in the first half of the paper would have strengthened this paper.” "Outstanding non-thesis paper that meets learning goals to a very high degree.” "Shows a strong grasp of the literature and provides two detailed case studies.” “The paper’s strengths were a wealth of information on the cases and an interesting research question.”

Target for O3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings

All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate mastery of the program’s stated learning objectives.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Eighteen students completed the requirements for the MA in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (including summer). Twelve opted for the non-thesis, six for the thesis. Eleven completed the thesis or non-thesis requirements in Fall 2006, six in Spring 2007, and one in summer 2006. Six of the MA projects were written in the field of American Politics and twelve 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 are provided below. Results for theses and non-thesis papers are broken out separately this year. Ratings indicate the average of ratings given by committee members on a scale of 1-5, with 1 indicating learning goals met to a ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating goals met to a ‘very high degree’. Theses (n=6) To what degree does the thesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.4 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.5 To what degree does the thesis demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 4.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 4.6 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 4.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 4.4 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 4.3. Selected open-ended comments on theses: "I expect this paper will be publishable in its final form." "Well focused, using the existing literature and using both statistical and case study research techniques." "This is a very strong thesis that effectively addressed a compelling research question that has both theoretical and policy implications going well beyond the particular cases studied.” "A very convincing and well-executed paper that, with some revisions, should be publishable in a good policy journal.” “An ambitious project that the candidate approached seriously and professionally.” “A fine thesis that was well-researched, beautifully written, and added to the existing literature. With revisions, it may well be publishable.” "...One of the two best Master's theses I've read while I've been at Georgia State (15 years)." Summary data for the twelve non-thesis papers are presented below (Scale 1 to 5, with 1 indicating ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating ‘very high degree’). Non-thesis papers (n=12) To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student's area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 a. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.6 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.6 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 3.2 Selected open-ended comments on non-thesis papers: “[Student] did a good job conceptualizing a research project based on mostly theory, formulated testable hypotheses and used data effectively to assess them. This nonthesis paper was as strong as many theses I've seen.” “This nonthesis paper just barely reached the minimum standard. It offered well-reasoned policy prescriptions, but fell short in failing to offer a robust analytical framework to address the question." "More extensive analysis of the cases and better application of the theories outlined in the first half of the paper would have strengthened this paper.” "Outstanding non-thesis paper that meets learning goals to a very high degree.” "Shows a strong grasp of the literature and provides two detailed case studies.” “The paper’s strengths were a wealth of information on the cases and an interesting research question.”
well beyond the particular cases studied. “A very convincing and well-executed paper that, with some revisions, should be publishable in a good policy journal.” “…An ambitious project that the candidate approached seriously and professionally.” “…A fine thesis that was well-researched, beautifully written, and added to the existing literature. With revisions, it may well be publishable.” “…One of the two best Master’s theses I’ve read while I’ve been at Georgia State (15 years).” Summary data for the twelve non-thesis papers are presented below (Scale 1 to 5, with 1 indicating ‘very low degree’ and 5 indicating ‘very high degree.’) Non-thesis papers (n=12) To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in the student’s area of specialization? Ave. rating: 3.3 To what degree does the nonthesis paper demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report in the student’s area of specialization? a. ability to formulate research questions Ave. rating: 3.6 b. ability to locate those questions within the appropriate literature Ave. rating: 3.5 c. ability to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 d. ability to analyze data to answer the question(s) Ave. rating: 3.1 e. ability to raise additional questions based on interpretation of research findings Ave. rating: 3.2 Selected open-ended comments on non-thesis papers: “[Student] did a good job conceptualizing a research project based on mostly theory, formulated testable hypotheses and used data effectively to assess them. This nonthesis paper was as strong as many theses I’ve seen.” “This nonthesis paper just barely reached the minimum standard. It offered well-reasoned policy prescriptions, but fell short in failing to offer a robust analytical framework to address the question.” “More extensive analysis of the cases and better application of the theories outlined in the first half of the paper would have strengthened this paper.” “Outstanding non-thesis paper that meets learning goals to a very high degree.” “Shows a strong grasp of the literature and provides two detailed case studies.” “The paper’s strengths were a wealth of information on the cases and an interesting research question.”

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

Reemphasize Research Design and Methods

Last year’s action plan called for a renewed emphasis on reinforcing research design and methods at the MA level. This year’s results show that thesis students had a strong grasp on the targeted research skills, while non-thesis students could use additional reinforcement. In an effort to address this issue, this year’s deadline for non-thesis papers was moved up in an effort to focus students’ attention at an early stage. This year, we will continue to work on improving the quality of non-thesis papers and thesis projects with respect to the learning outcomes we have defined. This will include continuing the stronger emphasis on research methods and design in regular coursework, as well as encouraging students to get an early start and to plan on multiple drafts for the non-thesis paper.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: Graduate director/chair

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We believe we have made progress on meeting our objectives for learning outcomes at the MA level and that, for thesis students, these goals are being met to a high degree. An examination of non-thesis papers showed that learning outcome goals were being met satisfactorily, though not to a high degree. Beyond the data gathered from surveys, there is additional evidence that our MA students are meeting learning outcome objectives. For example, a first year doctoral student who graduated from our department with an MA has had a revised version of her thesis accepted for publication. Our students routinely present conference papers at the most important national and regional academic conventions, and students have received prestigious, nationally competitive grants. Publications, invitations to present papers, and competitive grants are clear indications that students are achieving the department’s specific learning outcomes, as well as the paramount goal of producing effective scholars and practitioners in the field of political science. This was the first year that we broke out assessments of thesis projects separately from nonthesis papers. This is an important distinction that will allow us to pinpoint progress and ways to improve learning outcomes for the two groups of students, who, broadly speaking, tend to have different characteristics. All students who intend to go on at some point in the future to doctoral study are encouraged to write a thesis. Terminal MA students tend to write the non-thesis paper. On balance, theses produced this year were seen as fairly strong by the faculty committees evaluating them, and this is clearly reflected in the average scores given by thesis committee members on learning outcomes. We cannot compare these scores to last year’s averages, as they included nonthesis papers. The breakout of thesis and nonthesis scores makes it clear that across the board, thesis students are meeting the learning objectives to a higher degree than nonthesis students, which is to be expected. However, both groups of students are clearly
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

In the past, non-thesis papers were too frequently turned in at the last minute and were often of lower than expected quality. One general recommendation from last year was to place greater emphasis on the role of faculty in socializing and mentoring students, particularly in the writing of theses and dissertations. As noted above, a large number of students have once again presented papers at conferences, and faculty have continued to mentor students in the writing and publishing process. This year, an earlier deadline was instituted for nonthesis papers, and this served to focus the attention of students and their readers on the nonthesis papers at an earlier date, resulting in improved quality. However, further attention needs to be given to the ability of students writing non-thesis papers to demonstrate satisfaction of the learning outcomes to a higher degree. The data provided on non-thesis papers this year will provide essential baseline information that will be used to help us track progress toward the learning goals in future.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Political Science PhD

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. Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
4. Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 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.

### 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 field, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
2 students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (Summer 2006 through Spring 2007). The dissertations were in the fields of public administration and comparative politics. Last year’s report included information on the public administration dissertation, due to differences in the timing of the report. It is therefore not included in the assessment info here. Henceforth, summer semester will be included in the academic year that follows. 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. Information from the comparative politics dissertation is given below. Summary data from the form are provided below. This was an extremely strong student. Average Scale Score (1= ‘very low degree’ to 5= ‘very high degree’) (n=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: 4.5 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: 5 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: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student's competency in a second substantive field of political science outside his/her primary field? Score: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student’s ability and preparedness to teach in his/her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline? Score: 5 Selected open-ended comments: "Outstanding – easily the best I’ve seen at GSU."

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
2 students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (Summer 2006 through Spring 2007). The dissertations were in the fields of public administration and comparative politics. Last year’s report included information on the public administration dissertation, due to differences in the timing of the report. It is therefore not included in the assessment info here. Henceforth, summer semester will be included in the academic year that follows. 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. Information from the comparative politics dissertation is given below. Summary data from the form are provided below. This was an extremely strong student. Average Scale Score (1= ‘very low degree’ to 5= ‘very high degree’) (n=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: 4.5 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: 5 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: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student's competency in a second substantive field of political science outside his/her primary field? Score: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student’s ability and preparedness to teach in his/her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline? Score: 5 Selected open-ended comments: "Outstanding – easily the best I’ve seen at GSU."
Utilizing syllabi and data from student evaluations of graduate students teaching courses, the Director of Graduate Studies shall

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

2 students completed the requirements for the PhD in Political Science during the 2006-07 academic year (Summer 2006 through Spring 2007). The dissertations were in the fields of public administration and comparative politics. Last year’s report included information on the public administration dissertation, due to differences in the timing of the report. It is therefore not included in the assessment info here. Henceforth, summer semester will be included in the academic year that follows.

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. Information from the comparative politics dissertation is given below. Summary data from the form are provided below. This was an extremely strong student. Average Scale Score (1= `very low degree’ to 5= `very high degree’) (n=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: 5 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: 5 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: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student's competency in a second substantive field of political science outside his/her primary field? Score: 5 To what degree does the dissertation demonstrate the student's ability and preparedness to teach in his/her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline? Score: 5 Selected open-ended comments: “Outstanding – easily the best I've seen at GSU.”

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Five students took written comprehensive exams in December 2006. Three students passed all three of their exams, and two students each passed one. They retook their exams in May 2007, and the results were not available at this writing. Selected comments from the lead readers on successful exams: "This is a strong essay that does what comprehensive exam answers are supposed to do – it takes the question and runs with it, formulating a cogent argument and demonstrating a clear mastery of the literature, genuine understanding of relevant concepts, and good critical analysis. It is easily the best answer provided in the exam. “The response to this question is generally good, providing a clear, plausible argument and effective use of the literature.” “This is a comprehensive and clearly argued answer, well supported by appropriate literature. It presents a clear presentation of many of the major issues and debates in the [relevant] literature. A very strong essay. It merits a special mention for its thoroughness.” While at certain points, especially during the most detailed “literature review” moments, the answers do demonstrate a professional degree of formality, this degree is not maintained throughout the exam. The answers to all questions are too casual and too informal and the answers lack cohesion and organization. "This essay takes a clear position but does a poor job of substantiating it in the body of the essay.” The essay cites an impressive array of works but does not tie them together to answer the question."

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

Five students took written comprehensive exams in December 2006. Three students passed all three of their exams, and two students each passed one. They retook their exams in May 2007, and the results were not available at this writing. Selected comments from the lead readers on successful exams: "This is a strong essay that does what comprehensive exam answers are supposed to do – it takes the question and runs with it, formulating a cogent argument and demonstrating a clear mastery of the literature, genuine understanding of relevant concepts, and good critical analysis. It is easily the best answer provided in the exam. “The response to this question is generally good, providing a clear, plausible argument and effective use of the literature.” “This is a comprehensive and clearly argued answer, well supported by appropriate literature. It presents a clear presentation of many of the major issues and debates in the [relevant] literature. A very strong essay. It merits a special mention for its thoroughness.” While at certain points, especially during the most detailed “literature review” moments, the answers do demonstrate a professional degree of formality, this degree is not maintained throughout the exam. The answers to all questions are too casual and too informal and the answers lack cohesion and organization. "This essay takes a clear position but does a poor job of substantiating it in the body of the essay.” The essay cites an impressive array of works but does not tie them together to answer the question."

M 3: Teaching Effectiveness (O: 5)

Utilizing syllabi and data from student evaluations of graduate students teaching courses, the Director of Graduate Studies shall
assess the competence of the doctoral graduate students in teaching courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Doctoral students taught a total of 22 sections in Fall 2006, including one honor section (with a total of 12 instructors). 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. 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 by the POLS 2401 and POLS 1101 Coordinators to monitor teaching effectiveness by twice visiting each graduate instructor's class section. Student evaluations of graduate instructors constitute another indicator of teaching ability. Below are average scores on Question 17 for each of the courses taught by graduate student instructors in Fall 2006. Scores for spring 2007 were not available at this writing. POLS 1101 (5:Fall2006 4.4 POLS 2401 (9:Fall2006 4.5 POLS 3700 (1)Fall2006 4.5 Sample of open-ended student comments: Evidence of teaching effectiveness: "[Instructor] was very, very prepared for class and chock-full of information...passionate about what he teaches." "For my lack of political science interest, I must say that [Instructor] opened my horizons to new things. I gained greater insight and my interest level for Political Science was stimulated by the teaching method of [Instructor]." "[Instructor] loves teaching and her knowledge of the subject not only helped me with understanding this class but I was able to use these lessons to other classes this semester." "[Instructor] really cared about what the students were learning." "[Instructor] really opened my eyes to a new subject area in Political Science. After taking this class, I have found myself leaning towards a new area of study." "Good teacher and passionate about what she teaches...." "Sparked my interest in political science...Hardest class I had, but I think it was my favorite." "The instructor had extensive knowledge and clearly loved the subject." "[Instructor] made political science not only more interesting than it usually is, but also easier to understand." Weaknesses: "The text was the problem in this class...recommend another textbook." "Test questions are unclear at time." "The exams were difficult sometimes due to wording." "I would have benefitted more by [Instructor’s] instruction if he would have focused more on communicating valuable information from his lectures in written form instead of being heavily verbal.....Lots of valuable information was lost in the lectures because of heavy note taking and not enough prepared written information to stress critical points." Overall, the comments of students for this group of instructors were overwhelmingly positive. As always in the case of interpreting student evaluations, it is important to provide data on grade distribution. Below is the distribution of grades taught by graduate instructors in Fall 2006 and Spring 2007. Distribution of Grades in Courses Taught by Doctoral Students Fall 2006ABCD F POLS 1101132063211Ave: 2.8 POLS 2401107734214 Ave. 3.0 POLS 370042225 Ave.2.2 Spring 2007ABCD F POLS 1101161238429 Ave:2.8 POLS 2401121672812 20 Ave: 2.9 POLS 37008201254 Ave.:2.5

**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
Competency in 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.

**Continue focus on comprehensive exam preparation**

Last year, the Graduate Committee recommended that the goal of demonstrating mastery in a secondary field be measured through performance on comprehensive exams, rather than in the dissertation. As noted above, however, performance on comprehensive exams has been somewhat disappointing in the last few years. To help remedy this, doctoral students have been encouraged to
The training of effective graduate instructors continues to be a clear strength of the department. The department has also made progress in the training of research scholars. One of our doctoral students was awarded the very prestigious National Science Foundation Dissertation Improvement Award, as well as a GSU dissertation grant. 18 graduate student research papers were accepted and presented at professional conferences. One doctoral student had three papers accepted at the prestigious American Political Science Association meeting. This year the department graduated two PhD students, both of whom wrote very strong dissertations rated as having met learning outcome goals. The second, in Comparative Politics, was of the very highest standard. The department graduated two PhDs last year, and one this year. Eleven doctoral students have passed their comprehensive exams in the last 18 months; six of them have defended dissertation proposals and are on to the writing stage. Five more students are taking their comprehensive exams at this writing. Thus we expect to have a steady stream of doctoral graduates in the coming years. One general recommendation from last year was to place greater emphasis on the role of faculty in socializing and mentoring students, particularly in the writing of theses and dissertations. This has borne some fruit. As noted above, a large number of students have once again presented papers at conferences, and faculty have continued to mentor students in the writing and publishing process. As was the case last year, a review of the grad instructor student evaluations suggests that the vast majority of our students are acquiring the requisite skills for successful classroom management and course organization. Evaluations and observation by the coordinators of POLS 2401 and 1101 also suggest satisfactory substantive preparation for the courses instructors are assigned to teach. The DGS and the coordinators for POLS 2401 and POLS 1101 have met with graduate instructors at the beginning and end of the semesters this year in an effort to further strengthen graduate instruction. Students expecting to teach one of these courses in the upcoming year are 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 teaching the class. One of the department’s concerns last year was timely progress toward the degree for doctoral students. A number of measures have been taken to address this concern, as follows: 1. instituting annual assessment of the progress of doctoral students who have passed their comprehensive exams (involving written assessment of progress and expectations for the coming year by the student’s dissertation chair and a meeting with the student, dissertation committee chair and graduate director to discuss progress and expectations); 2. revision of the time limit for defending a successful dissertation proposal after comprehensive exams to a more realistic period that is enforced by conditioning assistantship funding on timely proposal defense; 3. limiting the number of credit hours a student can accumulate in order to reach the 3.4 GPA required by the department in order to take comprehensive exams; 4. establishment of a norm of four years of funding for doctoral students, with additional funding possible depending on resource availability and student’s progress and performance. Last year, the department voiced concern about the need to draw increasingly upon doctoral students to teach large sections of core undergraduate classes, due to the possible delays this could cause in making progress toward the degree. This year, the department secured greater funding for part-time instruction and visiting lecturer positions, which alleviated the problem to a degree. An additional two visiting lecturers will be teaching next year.
department intends to continue working to satisfy our desire to have all students produce high quality comprehensive exams. Last year, the Graduate Committee recommended that the goal of demonstrating mastery in a secondary field be measured through performance on comprehensive exams, rather than in the dissertation. As noted above, however, performance on comprehensive exams has been somewhat disappointing in the last few years. To help remedy this, doctoral students have been encouraged to redouble their efforts to prepare for comprehensive exams and to take a more proactive approach to preparing. Efforts have been made by faculty to encourage students to shift to a problem-driven, rather than a specific text-driven strategy for studying for comps. Student have taken this to heart, and have also begun to form study groups with greater regularity. Finally, the lackluster performance of some of our PhD students on comprehensive exams last year 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. This year, an even greater number of faculty have introduced assignments into their courses that give students a comps-like experience, and we expect this to contribute to improved performance in upcoming comprehensive exam cycles.

---

### Georgia State University
### Assessment Data by Section
### 2006-2007 Professional Accountancy-Financial Reporting & Assurance MPA

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

#### 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

**SLO 1: Analytical skills (M: 1)**
That students present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions

**SLO 2: Financial reporting skills: Develop (M: 2)**
That students apply professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment to develop financial reporting systems for decision making

**SLO 3: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (M: 3)**
That students apply economic, financial, and psychological theories to interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems

**SLO 4: Assurance skills (M: 4)**
That students provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts

**SLO 5: Collaboration skills (M: 5)**
That students contribute to collaborative efforts to achieve team objectives

**SLO 6: Communication skills (M: 6)**
That students demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant

**SLO 7: Technology skills (M: 7)**
That students demonstrate the technology skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant

#### 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

**M 2: Financial reporting skills: Develop (O: 2)**
Performance on assignments in Acct 8030

**Target for O2: Financial reporting skills: Develop**
80%

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
85%
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
80%

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100%

M 6: Communication skills (O: 6)
Performance on assignments in MBA 8015

Target for O6: Communication skills
At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
In the MBA 8015 communication course, 5 students received an A, 5 an A-, 8 a B+, and 6 a B.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
In Acct 8610, the average score on this assignment was 24 out of 25 points. In Acct 8030, score of 88%. In Acct 8410, score of 90%.

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
c
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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Technology skills | Outcome/Objective: Technology skills
Implementation Description: December 2006 in Acct 8610
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors teaching courses where tracking occurs
Additional Resources: The Acct 8610 instructor said it would be nice to have a grader.

Financial Reporting Skills
Although, on average, target level was met there was wide variation in student performance. Specifically, after intensive data analysis it was found that students who had not previously taken ACCT8030 did poorly on this learning objective. It was also found from SEIP feedback that students found certain topics in ACCT8030 boring and irrelevant. SEIP feedback also indicated that students found certain topics in ACCT8410 extremely quantitative and theoretical and of no practical significance. Therefore, planned action is to retain the current learning objectives of ACCT8030 and ACCT8410, but to delete ACCT8030 from the curriculum and transfer the LO of ACCT8030 to ACCT8410 and offer ACCT8410 as one integrated course on financial accounting theory covering both normative and positive accounting theory. The new integrated ACCT8410 course will retain only the most critical and relevant aspects of the current ACCT8030 and ACCT8410. All current LO of both 8030 and 8410 will be retained.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Financial Reporting Skills
Although, on average, target level was met there was wide variation in student performance. Specifically, after intensive data analysis it was found that students who had not previously taken ACCT8030 did poorly on this learning objective. It was also found from SEIP feedback that students found certain topics in ACCT8030 boring and irrelevant. SEIP feedback also indicated that students found certain topics in ACCT8410 extremely quantitative and theoretical and of no practical significance. Therefore, planned action is to retain the current learning objectives of ACCT8030 and ACCT8410, but to delete ACCT8030 from the curriculum and transfer the LO of ACCT8030 to ACCT8410 and offer ACCT8410 as one integrated course on financial accounting theory covering both normative and positive accounting theory. The new integrated ACCT8410 course will retain only the most critical and relevant aspects of the current ACCT8030 and ACCT8410. All current LO of both 8030 and 8410 will be retained.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Analysis that follows is keyed to objective number. (4) The MPA students performed as expected. They demonstrated significant knowledge of assurance services. (6) Students are exited the program with solid communication skills. (7) As with last year, the MPA students performed very well in meeting this assessment objective. The scores on the ACL assignments across the 2 years are almost identical and near the maximum score. In Acct 8030, the technology for searching professional financial accounting standards has improved considerably over the past year. This has made searching and applying the standards easier for the students. In Acct 8410, the performance level improved from 85% to 90%. Attributed to better support for students from University Library.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Analysis that follows is keyed to objective number. (4) Last year I used a final exam to test the students' knowledge. In the current year, I used a term paper in lieu of an exam. I believe that the students were better able to develop the necessary skills/objectives using this approach. (7) Based on the MPA students' performance, I don't believe that any additional changes will have to be made to continue the students' exceptional performance on this objective. In Acct 8030, instructor needs to keep up with latest search technologies for professional accounting standards and bring those into the classroom.
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: 3, 4, 5, 6)
Work with individuals and groups to effectively lead groups and affect change in the counseling relationship.

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 2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis (M: 4, 5, 6)
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 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
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others (M: 6)
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

O/O 4: Advocate for the profession (M: 1, 7)
Advocate by demonstrating actions that will further the identity and respect for the counseling profession.

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

O/O 5: Share knowledge with professional community (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)
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.

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
## O/O 6: Implement advanced counseling skills (M: 2, 3, 5, 6)

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.

### 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: 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 as U or S.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the student selected either the research or clinical track and successfully (S) met the requirement for residency.

**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 as U or S.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the student selected either the research or clinical track and successfully (S) met the requirement for residency.

#### M 2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 5.5

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 5.5

#### M 3: CPS 8650 Individual Response Paper (O: 1, 5, 6)

Students will successfully develop and present a paper for advanced relationship skills for client interventions and remediation.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will achieve a satisfactory or excellent rating on the paper and presentation. Rating assessment is poor, needs revision, satisfactory, and excellent. (1-4 rating)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a satisfactory or excellent on the papers and presentations.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will achieve a satisfactory or excellent rating on the paper and presentation. Rating assessment is poor, needs revision, satisfactory, and excellent. (1-4 rating)

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a satisfactory or excellent on the papers and presentations.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will achieve a satisfactory or excellent rating on the paper and presentation. Rating assessment is poor, needs revision, satisfactory, and excellent. (1-4 rating)
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students achieved a satisfactory or excellent on the papers and presentations.

M 4: CPS 8450 (O: 1, 2, 5)
Students will successfully participate (attendance) in an experiential part of CPS 8450

Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship
90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75%.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
The advanced group counseling class is taught once a year. Results are not available because an instrument was being constructed after the class was completed in 2006-2007. Results will be available for 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, there are only 4-6 Ed.S. students in this class that is mainly composed of doctoral students.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
The advanced group counseling class is taught once a year. Results are not available because an instrument was being constructed after the class was completed in 2006-2007. Results will be available for 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, there are only 4-6 Ed.S. students in this class that is mainly composed of doctoral students.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
The advanced group counseling class is taught once a year. Results are not available because an instrument was being constructed after the class was completed in 2006-2007. Results will be available for 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, there are only 4-6 Ed.S. students in this class that is mainly composed of doctoral students.

M 5: Media coverage of community crisis (O: 1, 2, 6)
Students will demonstrate through a written exercise in assessing how the media analyzed through writing the events of the crisis.

Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship
90% of the students will implement in his/her practice or agency learned elements of a successful crises preparedness. The student is evaluated in a 1-4 rating (poor, needs revision, satisfactory, excellent). 90% of the students will demonstrate behaviors reflecting the implementation of crisis preparedness.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated satisfactory or excellent in the implementation of the crisis preparedness skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated satisfactory or excellent in the implementation of the crisis preparedness skills.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated satisfactory or excellent in the implementation of the crisis preparedness skills.

M 6: Project for clinical relevance to crises (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)
Students will assess for individual and group crises for clinical significance. Students will develop a theoretical bases and skills of crisis counseling (individual and group). Students will take the on-line examination for the Certified QPR program

Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship
90% of the students will successfully present a project outlining skills for clinical relevance as a part of a counseling practice. Evaluation is determined by a rating scale of 1-4 (poor, needs work, satisfactory, excellent). A level of 3 or greater (satisfactory-excellent) is the minimum rating accepted.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the specialist students achieved a rating of satisfactory or excellent on the clinical relevance scale.
Target for **O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**
90% of the students will successfully present a project outlining skills for clinical relevance as a part of a counseling practice. Evaluation is determined by a rating scale of 1-4 (poor, needs work, satisfactory, excellent). A level of 3 or greater (satisfactory-excellent) is the minimum rating accepted.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the specialist students achieved a rating of satisfactory or excellent on the clinical relevance scale.

Target for **O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others**
90% of the students will successfully present a project outlining skills for clinical relevance as a part of a counseling practice. Evaluation is determined by a rating scale of 1-4 (poor, needs work, satisfactory, excellent). A level of 3 or greater (satisfactory-excellent) is the minimum rating accepted.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the specialist students achieved a rating of satisfactory or excellent on the clinical relevance scale.

Target for **O5: Share knowledge with professional community**
90% of the students will successfully present a project outlining skills for clinical relevance as a part of a counseling practice. Evaluation is determined by a rating scale of 1-4 (poor, needs work, satisfactory, excellent). A level of 3 or greater (satisfactory-excellent) is the minimum rating accepted.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the specialist students achieved a rating of satisfactory or excellent on the clinical relevance scale.

Target for **O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**
90% of the students will successfully present a project outlining skills for clinical relevance as a part of a counseling practice. Evaluation is determined by a rating scale of 1-4 (poor, needs work, satisfactory, excellent). A level of 3 or greater (satisfactory-excellent) is the minimum rating accepted.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the specialist students achieved a rating of satisfactory or excellent on the clinical relevance scale.

M 7: Implementation of specific theories in practice (O: 4, 5)
Students will provide a written description of specific theories that can be applied to his/her current counseling practice. The scenario is to be developed and implementation of theory elements described for client care. (philosophy, data gathering, assessment, treatment, monitoring functioning, and referral).

Target for **O4: Advocate for the profession**
90% of the students will be assessed for successful completion (adequate or excellent) of this description. The evaluation is based on a 1-4 scale (poor, needs revision, adequate, excellent).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students successfully met the adequate or excellent assessment for the scenario description relevant to best client care.

Target for **O5: Share knowledge with professional community**
90% of the students will be assessed for successful completion (adequate or excellent) of this description. The evaluation is based on a 1-4 scale (poor, needs revision, adequate, excellent).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students successfully met the adequate or excellent assessment for the scenario description relevant to best client care.

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
- 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
Implementation Description: May, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Gary Arthur

A follow-up is scheduled during the semester
Dr. Brack will schedule a follow-up of specific behavioral actions for effective trauma response skills.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

An assessment instrument is being designed
The lead instructor for advanced group is developing an instrument to assess for effective group leadership. This assessment tool will be completed by a group leader who has assigned the Ed.S student shadowing as a co-facilitator.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: CPS 8650 Individual Response Paper | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
  | Share knowledge with professional community
- Measure: Media coverage of community crisis | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
  | Process ethical dilemmas & lead others | Share knowledge with professional community

Implementation Description: April, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Greg Brack

Feedback regarding ethical responses
Internship supervisors (gsu and site) will provide behavioral responses to effective ethical responses to client care.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: CPS 8450 | Outcome/Objective: Lead groups in the counseling relationship
  | Process ethical dilemmas & lead others

Implementation Description: February, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Jonathan Orr, CPS faculty is the responsible for designing and implementing the instrument.

Specific advocacy behaviors surveyed
Instructors for all Ed.S. students will be surveyed for specific advocacy actions taken during 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, residency requirements will be reviewed for advocacy outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Form 1010 Supervisor’s evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Share knowledge with professional community
- Measure: Residency participation in profession | Outcome/Objective: Advocate for the profession
  | Share knowledge with professional community

Implementation Description: April, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Ed.S. instructors and Coordinator of the program

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Those EdS students 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 dilemma’s, 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. The program reduced the alternatives to two (research and clinical).
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 under girds 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, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 17)
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
1.3 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
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.4 Service as a resource to local, state, and federal entities

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15)
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
1.1 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, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 17)
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
1.1 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: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13)
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
1.1 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
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11)**

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**

1.1 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**

1.1 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: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 17)**

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, 11, 14, 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, 15, 16, 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 rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**  
90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals**  
90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**  
90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**  
90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training**  
90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students scored in excess of 3.0 on the 1-5 rating scale. The averages for written communication was 4.74 and 4.75 for oral communication with an overall average of 4.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: 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 3.0 or greater and graduate.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**  
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or greater and graduate.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students graduating students for 2007 had an overall grade point average in excess of 3.0.

M 3: 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.

Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.

Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.

Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</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 an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</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 an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</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 achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</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 achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students (61) had an overall average in excess of 3.0. The actual average was 4.63 on a 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.</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 successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.

Target for **O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.

Target for **O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.

Target for **O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.

Target for **O9: Complete an entry level program of training**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of the students passed the Departmental Examination upon first testing.

**M 5: 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 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for **O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for **O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for **O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for **O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the 61 students scored an average of 83% correct on the departmental examination using knowledge, skills, and attitudes for client care.

M 6: 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% will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, research.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The NCE for the year 2007 reflected that the Georgia State students scored 83.7% of the items thus 100 percent of the students met the goal. The Georgia State student’s score of 83.7% surpassed the national average of 69%, CACREP students of 79%, and 76.7% of non-CACREP students. The Georgia State students surpassed all of their peers.

Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, research.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The NCE for the year 2007 reflected that the Georgia State students scored 83.7% of the items thus 100 percent of the students met the goal. The Georgia State student’s score of 83.7% surpassed the national average of 69%, CACREP students of 79%, and 76.7% of non-CACREP students. The Georgia State students surpassed all of their peers.

M 7: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
The 2007 CACREP NCE results revealed a 71% correct rate for the department. When compared to the national average of 57%, CACREP program students of 66%, and non-CACREP students 63% the Georgia State students scored above all of their peers. This was 1% less than the departmental goal of 72%.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
The 2007 CACREP NCE results revealed a 71% correct rate for the department. When compared to the national average of 57%, CACREP program students of 66%, and non-CACREP students 63% the Georgia State students scored above all of
their peers. This was 1% less than the departmental goal of 72%.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The 2007 CACREP NCE results revealed a 71% correct rate for the department. When compared to the national average of 57%, CACREP program students of 66%, and non-CACREP students 63% the Georgia State students scored above all of their peers. This was 1% less than the departmental goal of 72%.

**M 8: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored an average of 76.88% on the CPS 6410 subtest of the departmental comprehensive examination.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored an average of 76.88% on the CPS 6410 subtest of the departmental comprehensive examination.

**Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**

90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored an average of 76.88% on the CPS 6410 subtest of the departmental comprehensive examination.

**M 9: Form 1015 Clinical Reasoning (O: 4, 5, 6, 7, 9)**

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.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment**

90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 interns had an overall rating in excess of 3.0 on Form 1015. The actual average was 4.86 on a 1-5 scale. This rating was assessed by on-site supervisors.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 interns had an overall rating in excess of 3.0 on Form 1015. The actual average was 4.86 on a 1-5 scale. This rating was assessed by on-site supervisors.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 interns had an overall rating in excess of 3.0 on Form 1015. The actual average was 4.86 on a 1-5 scale. This rating was assessed by on-site supervisors.

**Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 interns had an overall rating in excess of 3.0 on Form 1015. The actual average was 4.86 on a 1-5 scale. This rating was assessed by on-site supervisors.

**Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training**

90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on this sub rating scale

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 interns had an overall rating in excess of 3.0 on Form 1015. The actual average was 4.86 on a 1-5 scale. This rating was assessed by on-site supervisors.

**M 10: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 5, 6, 9)**

The CPS Departmental Examination has one subtest measuring research knowledge. The research subtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 students taking the research subtest of the departmental examination scored an average of 75.75%.

**Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the 61 students taking the research subtest of the departmental examination scored an average of 75.75%.

**M 11: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.

**Target for O2: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**

95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social & career assessment**

95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.

**Target for O5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students achieved a scaled rating in excess of 3.0. The actual average for 61 students of Form 1015 was 4.53 on the 1-5 rating scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Departmental Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 6, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPS departmental examination (150 items) has one subscale (12 items) assessing knowledge of developmental information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will score 72% of the subscale items correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students who took the departmental examination scored an average of 82.50%</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 score 72% of the subscale items correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students who took the departmental examination scored an average of 82.50%</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 score 72% of the subscale items correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students who took the departmental examination scored an average of 82.50%</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% of the subscale items correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the 61 students who took the departmental examination scored an average of 82.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 3, 4, 6, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on the developmental subtest based on a national sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results from the 2007 NCE for the CPS department 64 students revealed an 87% correct score on the human growth and development subject. When compared to other program students their score exceeded the national average (65%), CACREP program students (78%), and non-CACREP program students of 74%.</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 exceed 72% correct on the developmental subtest based on a national sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results from the 2007 NCE for the CPS department 64 students revealed an 87% correct score on the human growth and development subject. When compared to other program students their score exceeded the national average (65%), CACREP program students (78%), and non-CACREP program students of 74%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O6**: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on the developmental subtest based on a national sample.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The results from the 2007 NCE for the CPS department 64 students revealed an 87% correct score on the human growth and development subject. When compared to other program students their score exceeded the national average (65%), CACREP program students (78%), and non-CACREP program students of 74%.

Target for **O9**: Complete an entry level program of training

90% of the students will exceed 72% correct on the developmental subtest based on a national sample.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The results from the 2007 NCE for the CPS department 64 students revealed an 87% correct score on the human growth and development subject. When compared to other program students their score exceeded the national average (65%), CACREP program students (78%), and non-CACREP program students of 74%.

**M 14: CPS 6410 core communication rating scale (1-5) (O: 1, 2, 6, 8)**

Video tape rating scale (1-5) assessing effective self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. CPS 7660 rating scale 1010-35 items assessing general supervision, counseling process, and conceptualization (1-6 scale for overall counseling performance).

Target for **O1**: Effectively works with groups of clients

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 3.5 or higher on the counseling performance (overall) of Form 1010.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved an overall rating from faculty on self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. The actual average rating was 4.7. 100% of the students scored higher than 3.5 on Form 1010: Overall Counseling Performance. The average for this scale (1-6) was 5.03.

Target for **O2**: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations

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 3.5 or higher on the counseling performance (overall) of Form 1010.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved an overall rating from faculty on self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. The actual average rating was 4.7. 100% of the students scored higher than 3.5 on Form 1010: Overall Counseling Performance. The average for this scale (1-6) was 5.03.

Target for **O6**: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

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 3.5 or higher on the counseling performance (overall) of Form 1010.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved an overall rating from faculty on self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. The actual average rating was 4.7. 100% of the students scored higher than 3.5 on Form 1010: Overall Counseling Performance. The average for this scale (1-6) was 5.03.

Target for **O8**: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

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 3.5 or higher on the counseling performance (overall) of Form 1010.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students achieved an overall rating from faculty on self-disclosure, empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and concreteness. The actual average rating was 4.7. 100% of the students scored higher than 3.5 on Form 1010: Overall Counseling Performance. The average for this scale (1-6) was 5.03.

**M 15: CPS 7680 Form 1015 (1-5 scale) for effective ethic (O: 2, 6, 9)**

Students will be rated by on-site supervisors for effective application of ethics in client care.

Target for **O2**: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations

95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students (61) achieved an average score rating in excess of 3.5 by on-site supervisors for ethics. The actual average for 61 interns was 4.75 on the 1-5 rating scale.

Target for **O6**: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students (61) achieved an average score rating in excess of 3.5 by on-site supervisors for ethics. The actual average for 61 interns was 4.75 on the 1-5 rating scale.

### Target for O9: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students (61) achieved an average score rating in excess of 3.5 by on-site supervisors for ethics. The actual average for 61 interns was 4.75 on the 1-5 rating scale.

### M 16: Internship membership in American Counseling Assoc (O: 6, 8, 9)

All students entering practicum/internship (second year) become members in the American Counseling Association (ACA) 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the entering and completing students are currently active members of the professional organization (ACA).

### Target for O8: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the entering and completing students are currently active members of the professional organization (ACA).

### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training

90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

### M 17: Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for effectiveness (O: 1, 3, 6, 7, 9)

Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for counseling effectiveness in interviewing for data collection and in assessing for client needs through the counseling process and conceptualization (2 scales).

### Target for O1: Effectively works with groups of clients

90% of the students will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored in excess of 3.0 on Form 1010 subscales counseling process and conceptualization. The average for 61 students was 4.96.

### Target for O3: Can counsel with other educational professionals

90% of the students will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored in excess of 3.0 on Form 1010 subscales counseling process and conceptualization. The average for 61 students was 4.96.

### Target for O6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

90% of the students will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored in excess of 3.0 on Form 1010 subscales counseling process and conceptualization. The average for 61 students was 4.96.

### Target for O7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling

90% of the students will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored in excess of 3.0 on Form 1010 subscales counseling process and conceptualization. The average for 61 students was 4.96.

### Target for O9: Complete an entry level program of training

90% of the students will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.
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

Program faculty will 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 2007-2008 academic year and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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
- Measure: CPS 6410 core communication rating scale (1-5) | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: CPS 7680 Form 1015 (1-5 scale) for effective ethic | Outcome/Objective: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: CPS Departmental Examination | Outcome/Objective: Complete an entry level program of training
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: Departmental Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Can counsel with other educational professionals
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: For 1015 Overall Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Practices appropriate technology for counseling | Can counsel and consult with diverse populations | Can counsel with other educational professionals | Complete an entry level program of training | Conducts effective program evaluation and research | Effectively works with groups of clients | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: For 1015 Clinical Reasoning | 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
- Measure: For 1015 Cumulative end of Year Evaluation Scale | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Can counsel and consult with diverse populations | Can counsel with other educational professionals | Complete an entry level program of training | Effectively works with groups of clients | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: Form 1015: Written and Oral external | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Can counsel and consult with diverse populations | Can counsel with other educational professionals | Complete an entry level program of training | Effectively works with groups of clients | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: Grade Point Average | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Practices appropriate technology for counseling | Can counsel and consult with diverse populations | Can counsel with other educational professionals | Complete an entry level program of training | Conducts effective program evaluation and research | Effectively works with groups of clients | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: Internship membership in American Counseling Assoc | Outcome/Objective: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: National Counselor’s Examination | Outcome/Objective: Can counsel with other educational professionals
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
- Measure: National Counselor’s Examination | Outcome/Objective: Can counsel with other educational professionals
- Complete an entry level program of training | Practices educational, social & career assessment | Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored in excess of 3.0 on Form 1010 subscales counseling process and conceptualization. The average for 61 students was 4.96.
Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

**Implementation Description:** Fall 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?**

More than 90% of graduating MS students 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 all but one candidate passed the National Counselor’s Examination.

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

All 10 outcomes categories had averages above 4.5 on a 1-5 scale with a 3.0 set as the minimum performance level. No specific problem areas were identified in the 2006-07 academic year.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Psychology BA, BS**

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Psychology at Georgia State University has a long history of offering both undergraduate and graduate degree programs for both traditional and non-traditional students. Psychology is an extraordinarily broad field and the departmental curriculum reflects the diversity of our discipline. Psychology can be broadly defined as the study of behavior, and of those biological, psychological and socio-cultural factors that which create and influence behavior. It also encompasses the application of basic knowledge to improve the human condition. Psychology has links to numerous other disciplines (e.g., biology, sociology), and also a long tradition of interdisciplinary interaction and collaboration (e.g., education, medicine) based on shared goals in both basic and applied endeavors. The department offers a general undergraduate degree program that is integrated with the broader liberal arts education goals of the College of Arts and Sciences. It also contributes to the core curriculum for all undergraduates in the College. Our five doctoral programs provide specialized training in well-defined sub-disciplines of psychology: 1) Clinical, 2) Community, 3) Developmental, 4) Social-Cognitive, and 5) Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience. These programs share a common goal of preparing students to be competent scholars who will have the broad perspective and necessary skills to add to the knowledge base of our field.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Career Planning and Development (M: 6, 7)**

Students apply psychological principles to career decision-making. Students identify and pursue realistic career paths. Students identify realistic graduate education pathways. Students make practical career steps. Students value lifelong learning and ongoing professional development.

---

**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 2: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)**

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**

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**
### SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 2, 5, 6, 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
- 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 4: 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 5: Theory and Content (M: 7)
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.

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods (M: 2, 5, 6, 8)
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
- 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

### SLO 7: Application (M: 7)
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
- 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 8: Personal Development (M: 3, 4)
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.

#### SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 7)
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.

#### SLO 10: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 6)
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.

#### SLO 11: Values in Psychology (M: 6)
Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology. A. Students understand the need to behave ethically in personal and professional domains, and appreciate the need to tolerate ambiguity. B. Students demonstrate skepticism and intellectual curiosity, atunement to scientific evidence, civic responsibility, and respect for human diversity.

### 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
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
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 O4: Contemporary Issues - Core**
70% correct on each question in each section

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
For each of the 6 class sections, the percentage of correct answers was calculated for each student. The median percent correct for each section ranged from 60% to 76% with a mean of 71.6%. These scores represent a slight improvement since the 2005-2006 academic year. The increase in scores may be due, in part, to revisions in the exam. The revisions were made to accommodate a new text and base on input from instructors. An attempt was made to more carefully analyze the individual questions in order to ensure that the questions were appropriate and to provide feedback to instructors regarding topics that might need additional attention in the classroom. Nine questions were eliminated based on meeting both of the following criteria: 1. less than 70% of the students obtained the correct answer 2. the discrimination index was less than 0.40 in at least 3 of the 6 sections. Removing these questions, 29 out of 41 questions (70.7%) were answered correctly by at least 70% of the students in at least 4 of the 6 class sections. An analysis of questions by topic area was also completed. For each chapter, the number of questions answered correctly (out of total possible) by at least 70% of students in at least 4 of the 6 sections is presented below: Intro/methods6/7 Neuroscience 1/2 Sensation and Perception 3/3 Consciousness 1/1 Learning 3/4 Memory 2/3 Thought/intelligence 1/3 Motivation/emotion 3/4 Development 1/3 Personality 2/3 Social Psychology 2/4 Stress and Health 1/1 Abnormal 3/3 Therapies 0/1

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
One hundred fifty-four students had valid pre- and post-test data. The average post-test score was exactly 7 out of 10 correct (SD = 1.75), and the fiftieth percentile (i.e., median) was also 7 out of 10 correct, meaning that on average students fell shy of the learning outcome goal of 75% correct. Students did show substantial improvement from pre- to post-test though. The average increase of number correct from pre- to post-test was 4.44 items (SD = 1.91), which was a large and highly significant increase, t(153) 28.82, p<.001, d = 2.32. In the previous academic year (2005-06), the median score on the post test was 8 of out 10 (compared to 7 this year), and the average increase from pre- to post-test was 4.38 (compared to 4.44 this year). On average, students fell shy of the department's learning goal for post-test performance. However, there was evidence of substantial learning over the semester from pre-test to post test.

**Target for O6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
One hundred fifty-four students had valid pre- and post-test data. The average post-test score was exactly 7 out of 10 correct (SD = 1.75), and the fiftieth percentile (i.e., median) was also 7 out of 10 correct, meaning that on average students fell shy of the learning outcome goal of 75% correct. Students did show substantial improvement from pre- to post-test though. The average increase of number correct from pre- to post-test was 4.44 items (SD = 1.91), which was a large and highly significant increase, t(153) 28.82, p<.001, d = 2.32. In the previous academic year (2005-06), the median score on the post test was 8 of out 10 (compared to 7 this year), and the average increase from pre- to post-test was 4.38 (compared to 4.44 this year). On average, students fell shy of the department’s learning goal for post-test performance. However, there was evidence of substantial learning over the semester from pre-test to post test.

**Target for O2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
There was a significant difference between the pre and post scores of all the sections together (t was 4.719 with 100 df; significant at the .0001 level). However, there were only significant differences between the pre and post of three courses.

**Target for O8: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
There was a significant difference between the pre and post scores of all the sections together (t was 4.719 with 100 df; significant at the .0001 level). However, there were only significant differences between the pre and post of three courses.

M 4: Psychology 3110 listening and talking competencies (O: 2, 8)
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 O2: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With regard to the observational measure, students were required to demonstrate 1 of 3 skills: problem solving, the listening cycle or the awareness wheel. The students came prepared to demonstrate all of the skills but were required to only demonstrate one randomly chosen skill. 23/25 demonstrated a skill with 100% accuracy, 2/25 with 91% accuracy (so 100% with 91% or higher accuracy).

Target for O8: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With regard to the observational measure, students were required to demonstrate 1 of 3 skills: problem solving, the listening cycle or the awareness wheel. The students came prepared to demonstrate all of the skills but were required to only demonstrate one randomly chosen skill. 23/25 demonstrated a skill with 100% accuracy, 2/25 with 91% accuracy (so 100% with 91% or higher accuracy).

M 5: Discipline specific writing and critical analysis (O: 2, 3, 6)
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 O2: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the Fall 2006 term, the assessment scores for the ethics papers had a median value of 12, with a range of 10 to 15. The scores for the research papers had a median of 16 and a range from 8 to 19. A repeated-measures t-test showed that the research paper scores (M = 15.7, SD = 2.35) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores (M = 11.9, SD = 1.35), t(23) = 8.16, p < .01, one-tailed. For the Spring 2007 term, the median assessment score for the ethics papers was 11, with a range of 6 to 14. The scores for the research papers had a median of 14 and a range from 10 to 18. Again, a repeated-measures t-test suggested that the research paper scores (M = 14.1, SD = 1.80) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores (M = 10.8, SD = 2.18), t(23) = 7.28, p < .01, one-tailed. The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester. This goal was met for both the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 terms.

Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills
The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the Fall 2006 term, the assessment scores for the ethics papers had a median value of 12, with a range of 10 to 15. The scores for the research papers had a median of 16 and a range from 8 to 19. A repeated-measures t-test showed that the research paper scores (M = 15.7, SD = 2.35) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores (M = 11.9, SD = 1.35), t(23) = 8.16, p < .01, one-tailed. For the Spring 2007 term, the median assessment score for the ethics papers was 11, with a range of 6 to 14. The scores for the research papers had a median of 14 and a range from 10 to 18. Again, a repeated-measures t-test suggested that the research paper scores (M = 14.1, SD = 1.80) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores (M = 10.8, SD = 2.18), t(23) = 7.28, p < .01, one-tailed. The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester. This goal was met for both the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 terms.

Target for O6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

For the Fall 2006 term, the assessment scores for the ethics papers had a median value of 12, with a range of 10 to 15. The scores for the research papers had a median of 16 and a range from 8 to 19. A repeated-measures t-test showed that the research paper scores ($M = 15.7$, $SD = 2.35$) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores ($M = 11.9$, $SD = 1.35$), $t(23) = 8.16$, $p < .01$, one-tailed. For the Spring 2007 term, the median assessment score for the ethics papers was 11, with a range of 6 to 14. The scores for the research papers had a median of 14 and a range from 10 to 18. Again, a repeated-measures t-test suggested that the research paper scores ($M = 14.1$, $SD = 1.80$) were significantly higher than the ethics paper scores ($M = 10.8$, $SD = 2.18$), $t(23) = 7.28$, $p < .01$, one-tailed. The goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement in formal written communication in a discipline-specific style over the semester. This goal was met for both the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 terms.

### Target for O1: Career Planning and Development

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “N/A” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to communicate effectively and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric with an overall mean of 3.9 used to evaluate students ability to demonstrate the ability to formulate, new research questions, reach apt conclusions, and demonstrate intellectual curiosity and respect for human diversity. Because of the nature of the research projects, various supervisors used “NA” for this objective: 18% fall and 29% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 4: 91% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, ($N = 49$), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric, .77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.

### Target for O2: Communication and Collaboration Skills

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “NA” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to communicate effectively and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 3.9 used to evaluate students ability to demonstrate the ability to formulate, new research questions, reach apt conclusions, and demonstrate intellectual curiosity and respect for human diversity. Because of the nature of the research projects, various supervisors used “NA” for this objective: 18% fall and 29% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 4: 91% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, ($N = 49$), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric, .77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.

### Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “NA” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, (N= 49), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 94% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric .77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.

Target for O6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “NA” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 3.9 used to evaluate students ability to demonstrate the ability to formulate, new research questions, reach apt conclusions, and demonstrate intellectual curiosity and respect for human diversity. Because of the nature of the research projects, various supervisors used “NA” for this objective: 18% fall and 29% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 4:91% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, (N= 49), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 94% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric .77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.

Target for O10: Information and Technology Literacy

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “NA” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 3.9 used to evaluate students ability to demonstrate the ability to formulate, new research questions, reach apt conclusions, and demonstrate intellectual curiosity and respect for human diversity. Because of the nature of the research projects, various supervisors used “NA” for this objective: 18% fall and 29% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 4:91% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, (N= 49), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 94% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric .77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.
Target for O11: Values in Psychology
80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Some projects covered all six learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the six outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their development of research skills in either a laboratory or field setting with an overall mean of 4.6. Supervisors used the “NA” category 42% fall and 45% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 2: 90% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.6. Objective 3: 77% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 3.9 used to evaluate students ability to demonstrate the ability to formulate, new research questions, reach apt conclusions, and demonstrate intellectual curiosity and respect for human diversity. Because of the nature of the research projects, various supervisors used “NA” for this objective: 18% fall and 29% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 4: 91% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric, with an overall mean of 4.8 used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values by site supervisors. Supervisors rated this objective “NA” 3% spring semester. Objective 5: 85% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.4. The NA category was used 5% fall semester. Objective 10: Research practicum, (N= 49), fall and spring. This survey of career planning and development measures the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student’s satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience 4 or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 99% with overall mean of 4.7; encourage career/grad school goals, 90% with overall mean of 4.5; clarification career/grad school goals, 94% with overall mean of 4.5; and increased their skills in computer technology, 83% with an overall mean of 4.3. Students increased their knowledge of research, 98% with an overall mean of 4.7, and mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.6. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students using 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric, 77% with an overall mean of 4.5, and professional development, 57% with overall mean of 3.7.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Some projects covered all five learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the five outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 1: 75% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of psychological principles in a lab or field setting with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 7: 97% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 8: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values in psychology by site supervisors with an overall mean of 4.8. Because of the nature of some agencies, supervisors used the “not applicable” category 28% fall semester and 6% spring. Objective 9: 71% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.9. Supervisors used the “NA” category 28% fall and 6% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 10 (N=35), fall and spring. This survey measures career planning and development, and represents the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey, and the student’s satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience four or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 86% with overall mean of 4.4, encourage career/grad school goals, 92% with overall mean of 4.7, clarification career/grad school goals, 87% with overall mean of 4.3, mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.0, and an increased awareness of culture/stereotypes, 90% with overall mean of 4.5. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students, (55%), knowledge of community mental health, 66%, and professional development, (72%) 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric with overall means of 3.5 fall and 3.4 spring.

Target for O5: Theory and Content
80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Some projects covered all five learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the five outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 6: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of psychological principles in a lab or field setting with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 7: 97% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 8: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their increased awareness and knowledge of sociocultural and psychological values in psychology by site supervisors with an overall mean of 4.8. Because of the nature of some agencies, supervisors used the “not applicable” category 28% fall semester and 6% spring. Objective 9: 71% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.9. Supervisors used the “NA” category 28% fall and 6% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 10 (N=35), fall and spring. This survey measures career planning and development, and represents the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey, and the student’s satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience four or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 86% with overall mean of 4.4, encourage career/grad school goals, 92% with overall mean of 4.7, clarification career/grad school goals, 87% with overall mean of 4.3, mentoring, 90% with overall mean of 4.0, and an increased awareness of culture/stereotypes, 90% with overall mean of 4.5. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students, 55%, knowledge of community mental health, 66%, and professional development, 72%
or higher on the 5-point rubric with overall means of 3.5 fall and 3.4 spring.

**Target for O7: Application**

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Some projects covered all five learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the five outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 6: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of psychological principles in a lab or field setting with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 7: 97% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 8: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Because of the nature of some agencies, supervisors used the “not applicable” category 28% fall semester and 6% spring. Objective 9: 71% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.9. Supervisors used the “NA” category 28% fall and 6% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 10: (N=35), fall and spring. This survey measures career planning and development, and represents the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey, and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience four or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 86% with overall mean of 4.4, encourage career/grad school goals, 92% with overall mean of 4.7, clarification career/grad school goals, 87% with overall mean of 4.3, mentoring, 80% with overall mean of 4.0, and an increased awareness of culture/stereotypes, 90% with overall mean of 4.5. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students, (55%), knowledge of community mental health, 66%, and professional development, (72%) 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric with overall means of 3.5 fall and 3.4 spring.

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with a overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Some projects covered all five learning objectives and others offered students some subset of the five outcomes. The findings for fall and spring are: Objective 6: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of psychological principles in a lab or field setting with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 7: 97% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Objective 8: 87% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their ability to effectively communicate and use collaboration skills at their sites with an overall mean of 4.8. Because of the nature of some agencies, supervisors used the “not applicable” category 28% fall semester and 6% spring. Objective 9: 71% of students received evaluations of four or higher on the 5-point rubric used to evaluate their effective use of computers and technology with an overall mean of 4.9. Supervisors used the “NA” category 28% fall and 6% spring. The use of the NA evaluation reduced the rating for this objective. Objective 10: (N=35), fall and spring. This survey measures career planning and development, and represents the degree that a particular practicum experience will be able to offer all of the items on the survey, and the student's satisfaction with that experience. Students rated their practicum experience four or higher on the 5-point rubric for the following experiences: skill development, 86% with overall mean of 4.4, encourage career/grad school goals, 92% with overall mean of 4.7, clarification career/grad school goals, 87% with overall mean of 4.3, mentoring, 80% with overall mean of 4.0, and an increased awareness of culture/stereotypes, 90% with overall mean of 4.5. Students evaluated their opportunity to have exposure to graduate students, (55%), knowledge of community mental health, 66%, and professional development, (72%) 3 or higher on the 5-point rubric with overall means of 3.5 fall and 3.4 spring.

**M 8: 3030-Written description (APA) and interpretation (O: 3, 6)**

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 O3: Critical Thinking Skills**

Average rating of 3

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

One hundred thirty two students had valid data on the write-up and interpretation of statistical tests. 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. In terms of APA write-up, the average score across the three tests was 2.90 (SD = .92), with 50% 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 2.80 (SD = .86), with 50% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3.

**Target for O6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods**

Average rating of 3

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

One hundred thirty two students had valid data on the write-up and interpretation of statistical tests. 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. In terms of APA write-up, the average score across the three tests was 2.90 (SD = .92), with 50% 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 2.80 (SD = .86), with 50% of the sample meeting or exceeding the Department's goal of an average rating of 3.
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
- **Implementation Description:** November 30, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PSYC 1101 Course Coordinator and PSYC 1101 faculty

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: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues - Core
- **Implementation Description:** October 1, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee

Educate field and research supervisors on LOs.
Educate field and research supervisors on the learning outcomes important to 4760 and 4770.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Practicum Coordinator

Evaluate learning outcomes across the major
Review original matrix of learning outcomes across the major to assess their adequacy and determine how to expand assessment in additional courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Spring, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies

Improve practicum advising
Encourage students enrolled in the practicum program to attend the new peer advising and group advising sessions in the department to enhance their career planning and development in psychology. Suggest the peer advising program include a pre-registration group on career planning and development to help students choose appropriate field/lab settings for their individual professional development. Because this nine-item scale was generated by students listing the five most salient experiences they received from the practicum program three years ago, the program may need to recreate a survey every few years from students so their experiences and learning may match their changing needs. Encourage faculty to use more undergraduate students in their research labs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Psyc 4760 Research Practicum Evaluation form | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development | Critical Thinking Skills
  - Measure: Psyc 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development | Critical Thinking Skills
  - Measure: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills | Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
- **Implementation Description:** Spring, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Practicum Program Coordinator and Undergraduate Program Committee

Make sections uniform/increase academic content
The Interpersonal course will be revised for all sections beginning fall semester, 2007 in order to update the text and address concerns brought up by faculty and students. The goals of the revision are: 1) to make the information taught in PSYC 3110 more uniform across courses, 2) to increase the academic content of the course and to provide the student with up to date information on
the current issues, trends and research in the area of interpersonal relationships, and 3) to teach students practical interpersonal skills and provide information about how to improve personal and professional relationships. In order to address these goals, a new textbook as been adopted (Miller, R.S., Perlman, D. & Brehm, S.S. (2007). Intimate Relationships (4th Edition). New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies). Additionally, instructors will be provided with an instructor's manual (in which minimal course requirements are delineated), and a series of modules are provided for instructors to draw on. Three of the modules addressing 3 critical skills are required (the awareness wheel, the listening cycle, and problem solving/stages of conflict resolution) and 5 of the modules are optional (assertiveness, self disclosure, stages of change, motivational interviewing, and acceptance and commitment therapy). Instructors are required to assess learning in their courses. In order to facilitate this, a pre and post test will be administered by each instructor. An additional behavioral measure of the students' ability to perform the required modules (1-3) will also serve as an opportunity to evaluate student learning. Each semester, one class will be selected to behaviorally demonstrate the required modules.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Psychology 3110 listening and talking competencies | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills  
- Personal Development
- Measure: Psychology 3110 self-report pre-post assessment | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills  
- Personal Development

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** 3110 Course coordinator

### Revamp 3010 labs

In the coming year, the 3010 labs will be revamped to increase emphasis on the reporting and interpretation of statistical results. Instructors and lab assistants will be encouraged to require more extensive write-ups in lab reports and to grade them more based on three criteria: correct analysis/results, correct interpretation, and correct reporting. Additionally, instructors will be encouraged to place more emphasis during class time on challenging students to think about the meaning of statistical tests, rather than on rote computation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: 3030 - Written description (APA) and interpretation | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
- Measure: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Posttest | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Research Methods: Understand & apply methods

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** 3010 Course coordinator

### Revise the applied practicum evaluation form

Targets to measure level of performance moved from 4 to 3 of the 5-point rubric to average out "N/A" ratings. In addition, the 3 rating on the evaluation form will be modified to reflect an "acceptable" category. This rating was previously labeled "adequate." This change will improve the use of the scale. To improve assessment effectiveness faculty and field supervisors are encouraged to use the "N/A" category less often. Supervisors will expose students to more learning objectives in labs and field settings. Targets to measure level of performance moved from 4 to 3 of the 5-point rubric to average out "N/A" ratings.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Psyc 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form | Outcome/Objective: Application  
- Career Planning and Development | Sociocultural and International Awareness | Theory and Content

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Practicum Program Coordinator

### Revise the research practicum evaluation form

Targets to measure level of performance moved from 4 to 3 of the 5-point rubric to average out "N/A" ratings. In addition, the 3 rating on the evaluation form will be modified to reflect an "acceptable" category. This rating was previously labeled "adequate." This change will improve the use of the scale. To improve assessment effectiveness faculty and field supervisors are encouraged to use the "N/A" category less often. Supervisors will expose students to more learning objectives in labs and field settings.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Psyc 4760 Research Practicum Evaluation Form | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development  
- Communication and Collaboration Skills | Critical Thinking Skills | Information and Technology Literacy | Research Methods: Understand & apply methods | Values in Psychology

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester, 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Practicum Program Coordinator

### Target teaching and revise assessment

1. This data will be shared with the Spring 2007 instructors as well as the instructors who will be teaching Psych 1101 in the Fall 2007 semester. Instructors will be made aware of topics that were inadequately understood by students so that they can better address these in their future teaching.  
2. The nine questions identified above will be either: a. eliminated from the mastery test and replaced with other questions b. reworded to remove any ambiguities.  
3. Feedback will be obtained from appropriate faculty regarding content validity of the questions as part of an introduction to psychology mastery test. The test will be revised as necessary to better reflect appropriate concepts as well as maintain an appropriate balance of questions from the various chapters.
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, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

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

Institutional Priority Associations

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Psychology is making progress toward achieving its learning outcomes in the major and the core. Specifically, we consistently met target achievement levels for objectives in Psyc 3110, 4670 and 4770. The courses cover a range of objectives including 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, &10. We continue to identify needed refinements in our assessment procedures. The strength of the practicum program is the continued status as a culminating experience for students majoring in psychology. The 2006-2007 findings demonstrate students are receiving high-level learning and experiences in both research and applied psychology. Although, this is not a classroom experience, learning objectives are not able to capture what the practicum courses offer. Each research and applied experience is unique to the students within a particular laboratory and community site. The data indicate that 80% of students continue to perform well, receiving scores in the top twenty percent of the evaluations on nine of the ten objectives for the practicum program. Even though, supervisors continue to use the NA category for evaluating the scope of student experiences on various objectives, students continue to receive a diverse range of experiences that may prepare them to transition to careers or graduate school.

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

We continue to identify needed refinements in our assessment procedures for learning outcomes in Psyc 4760, 4770, 3110 and 1101 which cover all outcomes, The challenge to assessment in 4760 and 4770 is the number of evaluators (a 1:1 ratio of students to evaluators). The challenge in 3110 is to develop additional behavioral measures. Finally, in 1101, the challenge is to develop valid questions and coordinate numerous instructors. In terms of meeting target achievements, our assessment shows the need to improve our teaching methods to meet critical thinking skills, specifically in Psyc 3010, a foundational course in psychology. We hope that our ability to meet our target is improved with the redesign of Psyc 3010 and 3030 into a coordinated year-long course. Finally, in Psyc 1101, we see that we need concerted effort to coordinate better instructors so that all understand particularly difficult topics. Below, additional analysis specific to Psyc 4760 and 4770 is provided. Objective 10 demonstrates student’s desire of have mentors to aide their guidance in careers and professional development. This has not changed since the last reporting cycle. While there were improvements this cycle on several items of this web-based student evaluation of their practicum experience. Because this nine-item scale was generated by students listing the five most salient experiences they received from the practicum program three years ago, the program may need to recreate a survey every few years from students so their experiences and learning may match their changing needs. This outcome demonstrates students across both applied and research practicum desire for mentoring and professional development. This gap in the practicum program needs continued attention by improving the pre-registration advising component of the program, as well as the post-registration advising. The Undergraduate Program Committee, (UPC), addressed the post-advising component this year. The UPC initiated a group peer-advising program for undergraduate psychology majors, spring 2007. This program offers students an opportunity to meet with career specialist from the University Career Counseling Center, and others to discuss both graduate school and careers with a BA in psychology. This start-up program received a departmental award from the University to develop the program. The peer-advising program will continue to expand and cover other student advising concerns each semester. The practicum program along with other undergraduate specific programs would benefit by developing a relationship with this committee to assure practicum programmatic needs are known and addressed.
## 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 2: Research Methods (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 15)
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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15)
Communicate and work in groups effectively.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Application (M: 8, 9, 10, 15)
Apply psychological principles in professional activities.
Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**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 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15)
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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 8, 9, 10, 15)
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 15)
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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15)
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

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience
## SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 7, 10)
Incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international issues in their work.

### Relevant Associations:
Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.5 Global, cultural perspectives

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

## SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (M: 8, 9, 10, 15)
Emerge from graduate school with credentials and plans for career path.

### Relevant Associations:
Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
1.3 Quality professional programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

## 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 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
  80% passed on the first attempt.

#### Target for O2: Research Methods
90% passed on first attempt

- **Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
  80% passed on the first attempt.

#### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
90% passed on first attempt

- **Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
  80% passed on the first attempt.

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
90% passed on first attempt

- **Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
  80% passed on the first attempt.

#### Target for O8: Values in Psychology
90% passed on first attempt

- **Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
  80% passed on the first attempt.

### M 2: General Exam (oral defense) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8)
Conducted by committee of faculty

#### Target for O1: Theory and Content
90% passed on first attempt

- **Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Met**
  100% passed on the first attempt.

#### Target for O2: Research Methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (6 out of 8) of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: PhD Dissertation (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>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>02: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>03: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>05: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>07: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>08: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% passed on the first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Performance in statistics courses (O: 2)**
Psyc 8410 and Psyc 8420: Psychological Research Statistics I, and Psychological Research Statistics II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>02: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94% (17 of 18) earned a grade of B or better in Statistics I. The grade distribution was A= 11, B= 6, &amp; C= 1. 100% (17 of 17) earned a grade of B or better in Statistics II. The grade distribution was A=15 &amp; B=2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Performance in ethics course (O: 8)**
Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>08: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% earned a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>09: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% earned a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**
Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Personal Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% graded satisfactory (s) in PSYC 9960A (Practicum: Introduction to Teaching) and Psyc 9960B (Practicum: Advanced Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% graded satisfactory (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 9: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of course evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (1 of 2) Summer 06 GTAs received poor evaluations (less than 4 on question #17). 19% (3 of 16) Fall 06 GTAs received poor evaluations. 14% (3 of 22) Spring 07 GTAs received poor evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (1 of 2) Summer 06 GTAs received poor evaluations (less than 4 on question #17). 19% (3 of 16) Fall 06 GTAs received poor evaluations. 14% (3 of 22) Spring 07 GTAs received poor evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (1 of 2) Summer 06 GTAs received poor evaluations (less than 4 on question #17). 19% (3 of 16) Fall 06 GTAs received poor evaluations. 14% (3 of 22) Spring 07 GTAs received poor evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% (1 of 2) Summer 06 GTAs received poor evaluations (less than 4 on question #17). 19% (3 of 16) Fall 06 GTAs received poor evaluations. 14% (3 of 22) Spring 07 GTAs received poor evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% (1 of 2) Summer 06 GTAs received poor evaluations (less than 4 on question #17). 19% (3 of 16) Fall 06 GTAs received poor evaluations. 14% (3 of 22) Spring 07 GTAs received poor evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>2006-2007 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
<td>O7: Information and Technology Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the objective areas, as certified by the Director of Graduate Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% (3 of 88) of the annual student evaluations indicated problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Performance in program courses (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance in required and elective courses specified by the student’s program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of the students earned a grade of B or better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Thesis (proposal) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate thesis proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.

Target for **O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
60% (6 of 10) of the 3-year or higher students who have not completed their MA have had their MA proposal accepted. Of the four who have not, one is from the NBN program (and has since withdrawn), two are from COR, and one is from CLC.

**M 13: Thesis (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

Target for **O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

Target for **O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

Target for **O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% passed on the first attempt.

**M 14: Performance in the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
95% (18 of 19) earned a grade of B or better. Of the 19, 18 earned an A and the 19th student earned an F. The latter student withdrew from the program without completing her coursework.

**M 15: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10)**
Publications and presentations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Personal Development</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
<th>An average of 1 publication or presentation annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Each member of the graduate faculty reported an average of 1.71 publications co-authored by one or more students and an average of 4.19 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**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  
Implementation Description: Spring 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty members  

**Improve poor teaching evaluations**

Provide extra training to students receiving poor teaching evaluations (e.g., less than 4 on question 17).

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Implementation Description: Spring 2008  
Responsible Person/Group: Director of graduate studies and all faculty  

**Promote timely progress**

To increase the percentage of students who meet their milestones on or ahead of time. The plan is to encourage programs to make review of milestones a regular agenda item during their program meetings throughout the semester, rather than waiting for annual evaluation letters as the single point of review.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Spring 2008  
Responsible Person/Group: All members of the faculty  

**Standardize annual letters**

There are currently no uniform criteria for annual letters. The goal will be to have all letters refer specifically to milestones and outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Implementation Description: November 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies and all faculty members  

**Track General Exam performance**

To develop a more detailed system for tracking performance on the General Exam. Presently, the Graduate Program does not keep systematic records regarding failed attempts (only the date that students passed), or how the student performed in relation to the outcomes.
what specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The 2006-2007 Assessment reveals that more effective strategies are needed to monitor performance on outcomes. Consequently, many of the action plans are focused on improving data collection. Although the number of 3-year or higher students who have had their MA proposal accepted increased from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007, the 67% target was not met. Thus, this measure will require continued attention. The 2006-2007 Assessment shows that 80% of students passed the Written General Exam on their first attempt. This is a decrease of 10% from the previous assessment cycle, and does not meet the 90% target. The action plan that involves monitoring the performance on the exam in terms of outcomes may help identify areas of weakness that need remediation. The assessment showed that the percentage of GTAs who received poor evaluations was too high. An action plan will be implemented to involve providing extra training to students who receive poor evaluations. A new measure was added to the 2006-2007 assessment. Specifically, the number of publications and professional presentations was added, as it is an effective performance index for several of the outcomes. The assessment process showed, though, that better methods are needed to monitor and collect this information.
**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relevant Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Assess Public Health Conditions (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Identify and assess the public health conditions, both assets and deficiencies, of populations.</td>
<td>Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation &amp; Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address these conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Analyze Health Disparities (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Identify and analyze health disparities and design appropriate, culturally competent prevention and intervention strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Apply Theory in Field Settings (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<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: analytical assessment opolicy development/program planning ocommunication ocultural competency ocommunity dimension of practice obasic public health sciences offinancial planning and management, and oleadership and systems thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills in public health research and communication.</td>
<td></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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students are expected to receive at least a "B" in the core courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of the students failed to obtain a B grade in the six core courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**

60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.
Target for **O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

Target for **O5: Analyze Health Disparities**
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

Target for **O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Course evaluations are routinely reviewed and compared to previous year’s performance. In almost all instances, course evaluations have improved over time. In the one instance where that was not the case, the instructor was changed for the core course.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**
100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well
evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have enjoyed and benefited from the practicum experience, and virtually without exception, students have been well evaluated by their preceptors. In the two situations when students received less than satisfactory evaluations, they were counseled explicitly by their advisors.

**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.

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students have struggled with completing the thesis requirement due to lack of preparation in research methods. Accordingly, we expanded the number of required core courses from five to six and added a sixth course on research methods. This step has proven to be effective with an increasing number of students successfully completing their thesis requirements. To date, we have had 32 students successfully complete their thesis, and one student who failed to do so.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.

### 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.

#### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

We have not yet implemented our alumni survey, although the alumni were very active in the accreditation site visit process. The majority of our alumni provided feedback and/or attended a meeting with the accreditation site visit team, contributing to our successfully obtaining full, five-year accreditation.
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:** Analyze Health Disparities

- **Measure:** Successful Completion of Core Courses | **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:** Course Evaluations | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

- **Measure:** Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project | **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:** Alumni Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

- **Measure:** Course Evaluations | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Health Disparities

- **Measure:** Successful Completion of Core Courses | **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 PH 7019 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
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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
Curricular Revision

Based on our accreditation report, it was noted that we needed to provide more specificity to the structure of our three specialty tracks. Currently there are a wide variety of courses students can take to satisfy their specialty track requirements...too wide to assure achievements of specialty track-specific competencies. As a result of this input, the faculty has proposed curricular revisions, starting with students enrolling in August 2008. The curricular revisions will include adding one additional course to the core curriculum (Foundations of Public Health), increasing the number of core required courses from six to seven. The other change is that each of the three specialty courses will have four required courses specific to that track. Faculty are voting on the four courses for each specialty track at an upcoming faculty meeting.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Course Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Successful Completion of Core Courses | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Successful Completion of Practicum | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Understand Core Public Health Concepts | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Understand Core Public Health Concepts

Implementation Description: August 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Michael Eriksen, Director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments assisted in obtaining full, five-year accreditation from the Council on Education for Public Health. It also helped identify areas for curricular improvement in relation to new courses, or additional required courses.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Our assessments continue to indicate that students struggle with the thesis process, partly due to academic preparation and partly due to adequate planning. We have added courses to assist in improving academic preparation and we are developing guidelines for students to pursue a capstone project as an alternative to a thesis.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Public Policy BS
As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Bachelor of Science in Public Policy degree is to prepare students for roles as effective citizens and people who work in the public service. We seek talented and motivated students who wish to develop the knowledge, skills and values required to become responsible and visionary leaders in a wide range of settings. While many students choose to enter a career in the public sector or in nonprofit agencies, others make contributions to the community, state, and nation as active citizens in the civic and public arenas.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: New Program
This is a new degree program which has begun admitting students in fall, 2007

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: New Program (O: 2)**
This is a new degree program which has begun admitting students in fall, 2007

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
This is a new degree program which has begun admitting students in fall, 2007

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This is a new degree program which has begun admitting students in fall, 2007

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Public Policy PhD**
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: Knowledge of theoretical framework**
Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.

**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, 6)**
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: Theoretical Understanding of Public Policy (O: 2)**
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.
**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Seven students took core comps during AY 2006-07. All passed.

**M 2: Analytical Methods of Public Policy (O: 2)**

Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Seven students took core comps during AY 2006-07. All answered and passed the quantitative methods question.

**M 3: Field of Specialization (O: 2)**

Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Nine students took field comps during AY 2006-07. Eight (89%) passed.

**M 4: Original Research in Public Policy 1 (O: 2)**

Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Ten students successfully defended dissertation proposals during AY 2006-07. Five of them defended within one year of completing comprehensives. Two defended one semester late; one defended two semesters late; and two defended one year late. In addition, one student defended unsuccessfully and was terminated from the program. Five other students had not defended by the end of AY 2006-07, even though they were behind deadline. One is only one semester behind and should defend in the summer or fall. Another is one year behind but will defend in the summer. One has taken a leave of absence from the program. Two others are at least two years behind deadline and have now been given firm deadlines.

**M 5: Original Research in Public Policy 2 (O: 2)**

Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Eight students have successfully defended dissertations, all within seven years of beginning the program. Five students who passed comps have not or will not successfully defend dissertations within seven years of beginning the program. One has been terminated, one has taken a leave of absence, and one has withdrawn from the program. The other two have been given extensions until the end of summer semester.

**M 6: Original Research in Public Policy - 3 (O: 2)**

Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

**Target for O2: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

One-fourth of second-year students will submit proposals for conference papers. One-half of third-year students will present conference papers and/or submit manuscripts to journals.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Three of five second-year students, four of eight third-year students, and six of seven fourth-year students presented conference papers. Four third- or fourth-year students have articles in print or forthcoming, or have been invited to revise and resubmit manuscripts. Data on submissions are inadequate.
### Core Comprehensive Exams

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.

### Dissertations and Dissertation Proposals

In Fall 2006, the Admissions and Coordinating Committee met to assess the progress of students in the program and sent letters to 25 students reminding them of deadlines missed or approaching and of the consequences of missing them. At least partly as a result, 10 students successfully defended proposals this year, by far the most in a single year to date. In addition, we terminated one student, convinced another to take a leave of absence, encouraged another to withdraw, and gave three other students rapidly approaching deadlines. The latter three have been making more progress in the past year than in the previous two. The committee will meet again in May to assess the progress of all students in the program to make sure that students are meeting deadlines and to head off problems for newer students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program director

### Encourage conference participation

All second- and third-year students will present original research to faculty and other doctoral students in regularly scheduled sessions. First-, second-, and third-year students will be very strongly encouraged to attend. Faculty and doctoral students will critique presentations.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program director

### Encourage conference participation

Department will work to maintain an adequate fund from faculty research grants to subsidize travel to present original research at conferences.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program director and department chair

### Encourage publication

To ensure that students realize the importance of presenting original research at professional conferences and in refereed journals, the program will schedule special sessions on conferences and journal submissions annually.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** August 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program director
Full Time Students
Of the five students terminated, on leave of absence, or seriously behind on completing dissertation proposals, four have had full-time jobs since starting the program or at least for the last three years. We have decided to strongly discourage part-time status, to make it easier for students to attend full time, and to try to talk students out of taking jobs before completing their dissertations.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Program director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Students did well on comprehensive examinations, indicating that they are learning the required material or that we are grading too easily. Conference participation was stronger than realized. Journal publication was adequate. The program carried out most of the items in the action plan. The program was able to subsidize conference travel for at least 13 doctoral students. Formal letters of warning went out to appropriate doctoral students. The program held its first meeting to assess the progress of students. Most advanced, full-time students presented research to faculty and doctoral students.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Timely completion of dissertation proposals and dissertations is improving, but we clearly need to keep the pressure on and think about ways to improve in this area. The session on writing a dissertation was not held last year, but will be held this year. The research seminar appears to have been particularly successful this year in helping students develop dissertation proposals. Conference presentations and journal submissions still need to be strengthened to make our students more marketable. The committee proposed cutting Georgia State fields of specialization from 7 to 3 and to commit to annual doctoral seminars in all 3; the faculty agreed to cut the specializations to 4. The fourth field is still being studied to determine how to strengthen or eliminate it.
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: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities (M: 4)
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 5: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction (M: 5)
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating - Content Knowledge - Reading/Writing (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 1 will be derived from written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Target for O1: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% completion rate. 14 of our 14 completers scored at a level 4 or higher.

M 2: Faculty Rating - Research-based Reading Instruction (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 Research-based Reading 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% completion rate. 14 of our 14 completers scored at a level 4 or higher.

M 3: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments (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 Reading 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% completion rate. 14 of our 14 completers scored at a level 4 or higher.

M 4: Faculty Rating - Professional Behaviors/Activities (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% completion rate. 14 of our 14 completers scored at a level 4 or higher.

### M 5: Faculty Rating - Assessment To Plan Instruction (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).

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

#### Increase Attention to Writing Instruction

Faculty will examine coursework with in 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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 School Year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Reading, Language, and Literacy Education Faculty

#### Alignment of courses

Three required courses for this degree (EDRD 7650, EDRD 8610, and EDCI 7660) have been redesigned to address the latest research in the field of literacy. Changes include more direct work with struggling readers in a clinic and community setting as well as professional development for teachers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Assessment To Plan Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Content Knowledge - Rdg/Wrtng | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Professional Behaviors/Activities | Outcome/Objective: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Research-based Reading Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction

- **Implementation Description:** summer 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott

#### Literacy Clinic Work

For the 2007-2008 academic year, this program will involve more direct work in our new literacy clinic.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Assessment To Plan Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Content Knowledge - Rdg/Wrtng | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Professional Behaviors/Activities | Outcome/Objective: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities
  - Measure: Faculty Rating - Research-based Reading Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction

- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
Regarding Action Items 1 (Increase attention to writing instruction) and 2 (Integrate additional attention to research articles), the courses have been refocused to address these items. Specifically, three required courses (EDRD 7650, EDRD 8610, and EDCI 7660) have been designed to build upon each other and the design is based on the latest research in the field of literacy teacher preparation. Students will be reading research articles related to the design of their program and its impact in schools.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although students met all of the objectives, faculty have made changes to strengthen the program. The primary faculty in this program have met to redesign the required courses so that research in the field is integrated into the courses. An emphasis on writing theories and instruction has been included in the changes that have been made. These changes will be implemented during the coming academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Reading, Language, & Literacy—TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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
### Measurable Outcomes

#### 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

**M1:** 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
87% of the candidates "demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge."

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
85% of the candidates demonstrate an "understanding of student development re: learning."

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
87% of the candidates "can effectively teach diverse groups of learners."

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
87% of the candidates "know and use multiple instructional strategies."

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
77% of the candidates "can motivate and manage students for learning."

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77% of the candidates &quot;use communication skills and technology.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: Faculty STARS Rating 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates &quot;can effectively plan for instruction.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 8: Faculty STARS Rating 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79% of the candidates &quot;understand and use assessment for learning.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 9: Faculty STARS Rating 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the candidates &quot;practice professional reflection.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 10: Faculty STARS Rating 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at &quot;involving school and community in learning&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The candidates in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL program continue to perform well on all assessments. The program, while growing in size, is committed to excellence and high faculty involvement.

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

As the number of candidates increase in the program, there needs to be continued attention on collaboration and communication among all interested parties, specifically between faculty, supervisors, students and cooperating teachers.
### Mission / Purpose

The BBA real estate major is designed for individuals entering careers in the real estate industry. It provides the student with the real estate knowledge and analytical skills necessary to support real property decisions in business environments as well as the requisite skills to effectively communicate them. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop:
1) sufficient industry 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

78% average grade with 68% of the students achieving the target performance level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

81% average numerical score with 70% of the students achieving the target performance level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

86% average grade with 93% of the students achieving the target performance level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

79% average grade with 74% of the students achieving the target performance level.
## 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

### Grading by some professors

In real estate development and to a lesser extent real estate finance we have new teachers who graded higher than we would normally expect. We will meet with those professors to discuss their evaluation methods.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Assignments in the finance and mortgage course
- **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

- **Measure:** Assignments in the real estate development course.
- **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

- **Implementation Description:** 8/15/06
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Real Estate Department Chair
- **Additional Resources:** None

### Improve percentage of students that meet target

The faculty will meet to discuss various ways that we can improve the percentage of students that meet the target level of performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Assignments in the finance and mortgage course
- **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

- **Measure:** Assignments in the real estate development course.
- **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

- **Measure:** Assignments in the real estate investment course.
- **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

- **Implementation Description:** 9/1/07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** 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 we are generally satisfied with the results of the assessment but further improvement is always possible.

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

Everything requires continuous attention. We need to do a better job of educating our teachers with respect to evaluation of students.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Real Estate MS**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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.

## 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.

## 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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Investment assignments in the capstone course (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Target: Met</td>
<td>Performance on investment assignments in the case study capstone course. 8.0 average with 75% meeting the target performance level. However only 4 students were measured due to low enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Financing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Target: Met</td>
<td>Performance on real estate financing assignments in the case study capstone course. 8.25 average with 100% of the students meeting the target performance level. However only 4 students were measured due to low enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Marketing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Target: Met</td>
<td>Performance on real estate marketing assignments in the case study capstone course. 7.5% Average with 50% of the students meeting the target performance level. However only 2 students were measured due to low enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Leadership performance on NAIOP competition (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Target: Met</td>
<td>Leadership skills observed by faculty advisor in NAIOP competition. 9.5 Students exemplified excellent leadership skills in this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Teamwork among the various member of NAIOP team (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Target: Met</td>
<td>Students should all be contributing members to team as observed by the faculty advisor. 9.0 Students exemplified excellent teamwork in this year’s competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Ability to provide functional expertise to team. (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students should be able to provide functional expertise to the NAIOP team as observed by the faculty advisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O3: To become contributing members of effective team.

7.5

Findings 2006-2007 - Target:
9.5. Students exemplified excellent functional expertise in this year’s competition.

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

Improve percentage of students that meet target
Not all students met the performance targets in investments and marketing. The faculty will meet to discuss ways we can improve in these two areas.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Investment assignments in the capstone course | Outcome/Objective: To develop creative decision-making skills
Measure: Marketing assignments in capstone course | Outcome/Objective: To develop creative decision-making skills

Implementation Description: 9/1/07
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chairman
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Because of low enrollment in the program, it is difficult to draw any sweeping conclusions. However, overall performance was generally regarded as good.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to work on some of the decision making skills to ensure that all our students possess the necessary skills to be successful in the real world.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Rehabilitation Counseling MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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, APACHE 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 respondants, 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- a. Over previous year, 100% passed CRC exam.
- b. Over all ratings by graduates exceed 4.0 on all categories (scale 1 to 5).
- c. All supervisors of student interns rated the program good or higher with the average meeting or exceeding 4.0 on scale of 1 to 5. Only one student did not pass the comprehensive exams the first time.
- d. Accreditation was continued without conditions.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- All students but one have achieved passing grades. The one student who did not achieve a passing grade (practicum) dropped from the program. Reportedly she qualified for a hardship withdrawal but did not file the necessary request.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- a. Grades on papers, presentations and exams have all met expectations.
- b. Written evaluations of students have exceeded expectations.
- c. Practicum evaluation results have met or exceeded expectations.
- d. All students who worked with a person with a disability on the assessment project passed.
- e. Internship supervisors who responded to the questionnaire (6) rated the students as good or higher.

**M 4: Counsel and consult 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) assessment project. (b) class knowledge content domains associated with assessment of rehabilitation potential (CPS 7430). (c) acceptable evaluation by internship site supervisor and passing grade by faculty instructor for practicum and internship classes (7660, 7680). (d) 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

- a. All students passed the assessment course.
- b. All students but one (who dropped from the program) have passed the practicum class.
- c. All students but one (who dropped from the program) have passed the internship class.
- d. CRC exam pass rates for graduates for past year was 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
- 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

Continue reviews for ethical conduct
Contact rehabilitation faculty internship supervisors to assess student compliance and competence

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- 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: April 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed, Joe Hill

Demonstrate effective counseling/consultation
Assess student’s effective counseling/consultation with people with disabilities

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Counsel and consult with diverse populations | Outcome/Objective: Counsel and consult with diverse population
- Implementation Description: April 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed

Evaluation student work w/ people with disability
Judge evaluation of student work with people with disabilities through questionnaires to internship supervisors and faculty supervisors

- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- 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: April 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed
- Additional Resources: Student assistant, postage
Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
Over the past year, the rehabilitation counseling program has exceeded goals through assessments associated with student grades, assessment project grades and national certification scores. Questionnaires sent to past students (graduating approximately one year prior) and on-campus internship supervisors underscore the value of the program.

Contributions to the Institution
Graduates of the rehabilitation counseling program are uniquely trained to help people with mental, cognitive and physical disabilities lead productive lives. Many of the students are people with disabilities thereby assisting the institution on two fronts. We believe that graduates of our program make significant contributions to the welfare of citizens and enjoy an excellent professional reputation which spotlights Georgia State University's value to the community.

Highlights
100% pass rate on the national certification exam (compared with 76% nationwide). Ratings of 4 or above on the annual questionnaires sent to off-campus internship supervisors (typically employers). Ratings of 4 or above on all scales from past graduates with regard to their experiences at Georgia State University. Excellent pass rates of the masters comprehensive exam.

Challenges
Student recruitment for the program has been a challenge. Over the past year substantial activity was initiated to bring awareness to potential students through on-line brochures, on-campus departmental information sessions, speaking at various classes, attending (via representatives) career fairs at several universities, and networking with professionals who work in allied professions.

Teaching Activities
The coordinator teaches counseling theories, two sections of medical and psychological aspects of disability, and the assessment of rehabilitation potential class. One part-time instructor/doctoral student has received several awards over the past 12 to 18 months.

Research and Scholarly Activities

Public/Community Service
Service related by Program Coordinator only: Evaluator - Fellow applicant, International Academy of Life Care Planners, May, 2007 Evaluator – University of Florida Grant Proposal class for Rick Robinson. Evaluator - Fellow applicant, International Academy of Life Care Planners, January, 2007 Outside reviewer for promotion and tenure, University of Tennessee, 2006 (Dr. Dunn). Book proposal reviewer – The physician as a defendant, expert or consultant in litigation. Taylor & Francis Publishers, 10/06. – Effective expert witnessing. Taylor & Francis Publishers, 10/06. Book proposal reviewer – Certification tests and major exams | Outcome/Objective: Education in rehabilitation counselor areas

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our program evaluation has exceeded expectations in all areas. CRC exam rate nationwide over the last year was 76% while GSU students obtained 100% pass rate. Questionnaires to graduates and internship supervisors were rated, on average, 4.0 or above on 1 to 5 point scale on all measures.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Only minor refinements seem to be in order. For example, the required "stand alone" ethics class probably needs more rehab specific content.

Re-accreditation
Over the next academic year, prepare for an on-site re-accreditation review by the Council on Rehabilitation Education.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Certification tests and major exams | Outcome/Objective: Education in rehabilitation counselor areas

Implementation Description:
Fall through spring semester

Responsible Person:
Roger Weed

Additional Resources:
Student assistants and site visit financing
## 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
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 8: Religion and Culture (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to recognize and explain the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture.

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
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 9: Historical Applications of Religion (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to comprehend the ways that people in different cultures develop and apply religious resources.

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
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

SLO 10: Reading Critically (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to read critically and with comprehension.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Critical Thinking--major

Institutional Priority Associations
1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 11: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 2, 3, 4)**

Ability to think critically and write persuasively.

**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
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 12: Applying Logical Principles (M: 2, 3, 4)**

Ability to apply principles of logic to the religious studies discourse

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

**SLO 13: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2, 4)**

Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

**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
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 38% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 38% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 38% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O4: Major Theorists</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5: Theory and Method</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6: Scholarly Categories</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7: Comparative Approach</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8: Religion and Culture</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9: Historical Applications of Religion</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10: Reading Critically</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13: Conducting Research</td>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 57% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 43% of faculty evaluations for content of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.

**Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses — 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O13: Conducting Research

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As in the previous year, 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. Students repeatedly 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. Students also praised the Department’s involvement with the Pluralism Project, the emphasis on comparative methods, and the teaching of critical reading 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 and course offerings, different scheduling of courses, reassessment of cross-listing courses – tended to address expansions of (rather than corrections to) the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 62% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 48% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 38% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 62% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 48% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 38% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Student Surveys (Numerical) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)

Each graduating major is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies major with regard to specific learning outcomes, i.e., understanding the nature and varieties of religion, familiarity with critical theory and major theorists, 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: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.86. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.71. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.86. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.86. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.71. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 5.00. Ability to think and write critically: 4.71. Ability to conduct research: 4.43. By way of synthesis, 96% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 82% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4.50 or higher. 50% 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.
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
- **Conducting Research**: General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Major Religious Thinkers | Major Theorists | Religion and Culture | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method

- **Conducting Research:** General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Major Religious Thinkers | Major Theorists | Religion and Culture | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method

**Implementation Description:** February 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Departmental Assessment Committee

#### Critical Thinking Through Writing

The Department as a whole, in close communication with the Undergraduate Committee, should begin extended conversations on how courses will be added or augmented to satisfy the university’s initiative on critical thinking through writing, how such courses will be staffed, and what criteria the department will adopt in implementing such courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Evaluating Capstone Papers (Content) | **Outcome/Objective:** Reading Critically
  - Scholarly Categories | Theory and Method
- **Measure:** Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) | **Outcome/Objective:** Applying Logical Principles
  - Critical Thought and Expression

**Implementation Description:** March 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Faculty as a whole.

**Additional Resources:** The Department will require additional tenure-track faculty before it will be able adequately to staff courses designated as relevant to this initiative.

#### Reassessing Cross-listed Courses

The Undergraduate Committee should begin a thorough reassessment of which courses outside the Department should or should not count toward the undergraduate major.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

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

- **Measure:** Student Surveys (Narrative) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach
  - General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Major Religious Thinkers | Religion and Culture | Specific Religious Traditions

**Implementation Description:** October 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jonathan Herman

#### Religious Studies Search

The Department should be mindful of the stipulated learning outcomes and adjectives, as well as student demand, in configuring the forthcoming search(es) for new faculty.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Evaluating Capstone Papers (Content) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Specific Religious Traditions
- **Measure:** Student Surveys (Narrative) | **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Specific Religious Traditions

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

#### Research in Religious Studies
The Department as a whole should meet to consider whether steps are necessary to guarantee that there continues to be a sufficient research component in the B.A. in Religious Studies. This could include designating certain courses as research-based, adding distributional requirements, or conducting periodic workshops on research.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Content) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thought and Expression
- Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research

Implementation Description: March 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Department Faculty as a whole.

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 achieving the Department's articulated learning goals, and have been doing so since this assessment process began. 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. The average overall score assigned by students was nearly 4.7; in only one area of evaluation (ability to conduct research) did students rate their experience lower than 4.6 (on a 5.0 scale), and this most likely reflected statistical "noise" rather than a substantial concern (the rating the previous year was 4.88). 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?
First, continued attention should be given to the ongoing collection of data. Along these lines, students should be provided with exit surveys in a timely fashion, and they should be reminded periodically of the importance of their honest responses. In addition, faculty should monitor the configuration of upper-level courses, to produce an adequate pool of student papers for consideration. Secondly, continued attention should be given to the data collected at each graduation cycle, with an eye toward any "red flags," e.g., decline in student numerical ratings in any particular area, diminished quality of student papers, and so on. The faculty, in meeting to discuss the implementation of its Critical Thinking Through Writing plan by the Fall of 2009, should concurrently consider whether all majors are acquiring the research skills necessary for the discipline.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Religious Studies, MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: History of Religions (M: 1)
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Theories of Religion (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Methodological Approaches to Religion (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Theoretical categories and concepts (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand and apply major terms and concepts in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Comparative Approach (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to at least one specific theme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice (M: 1)</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>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Reading Scholarly Texts (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
SLO 9: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 2)
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
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O2: Theories of Religion
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O4: Theoretical categories and concepts
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O5: Comparative Approach
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O6: Role of Religious Experience and Practice
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O7: Reading Scholarly Texts
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007** - **Target: Met**
95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

Target for O8: Conducting Research
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

95% of student theses received a ranking of B or higher.

### M2: 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**

75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

86% of student theses were ranked B or higher.

**Target for O8: Conducting Research**

75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

86% of student theses were ranked B or higher.

**Target for O9: Critical Thought and Expression**

75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

86% of student theses were ranked B or higher.

### 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

**Implementation Description:** Summer of 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

#### Assessing Content Knowledge

On future assessment cycles, committee members will be asked to provide written comments on each student's content knowledge, in addition to providing a content knowledge grade. These comments will provide specific information that the program can respond to as it continues to develop its graduate training.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Content)  
- Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
- History of Religions
- Methodological Approaches to Religion
- Role of Religious Experience and Practice
- Theoretical categories and concepts
- Theories of Religion

**Implementation Description:** May 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

#### Assessing Discipline Skills

On future assessment cycles, committee members will be asked to provide written comments on each student's discipline skills, in addition to providing a skills grade. These comments will provide specific information that the program can respond to as it continues to develop its graduate training.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Skills)  
- Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Critical Thought and Expression
- Reading Scholarly Texts

**Implementation Description:** May 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond
Reframing Thesis Process
Reframing the early stages of the masters thesis process (specifically the development of the masters thesis prospectus) to include more input from the thesis director.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
  - Critical Thought and Expression | Reading Scholarly Texts

Implementation Description: November 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

Theory and Method Course
The Graduate Committee will draft a proposal, which requires students to take "Theories of Religion"(or a comparable new course), in order to introduce students to the background of the discipline.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Masters Theses (Content) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  - Conducting Research | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts | Theoretical categories and concepts | Theories of Religion

Implementation Description: March 2008
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?
The 06-07 academic year was the first in which a cohort of students admitted to the new Religious Studies Masters degree program reached the point of graduation. Overall, the Department is very satisfied with the performance of students in the MA program. All students who attempted to defend an MA thesis succeeded and showed high abilities in both content and skills. These internal judgments were confirmed by the fact that graduating students were accepted for Ph.D. studies at Emory, McGill, Florida State, and Duke, most receiving large scholarship packages. The students’ abilities to e-mail copies of their theses to faculty and to upload their theses to the Graduate Office website 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?
Given that 06-07 represented the first year in which students admitted into the M.A. program reached the point of graduation, the Department believes it would be imprudent to initiate significant changes, especially since initial results seem to be so positive. The Department plans to initiate the changes outlined above, included adding a requirement that written comments be solicited of M.A. thesis committees and the sequencing of the prospectus proposal process be reexamined, and the faculty members recognize a need for additional faculty, as outlined in the recent Action Plan.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Respiratory Therapy BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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, 8, 9, 12)
Students will be able to communicate effectively as a member of the healthcare team both orally and in writing.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major

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, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15)

Students will be able to demonstrate respiratory therapy skills at the advanced registry level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 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
- 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Critical Thinking--major
- 13 Technology--major

**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, 12)

Students will exhibit professional behaviors as a member of the healthcare team.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Oral Communication--core
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 9 Contemporary Issues--major

**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: 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 15)

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: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Students will be able to think logically and in meaningful ways so that their actions reflect their critical thinking.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness
- 1.2 Excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: 1. Case presentations (O: 1, 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case presentation scores will average 88% based on standard rubric for the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care** |
| Case presentation scores will average 88% based on standard rubric for the Division. |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - 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, 5, 6)** |
| 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| Thirty-seven seniors attempted the exam with 28/37 or 76% passing on the first attempt. With retakes, 33/37 have passed at this point for a 89% pass rate. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to successfully pass after graduation. |

| **Target for O5: use of technology** |
| passing score as determined by the NBRC |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| Thirty-seven seniors attempted the exam with 28/37 or 76% passing on the first attempt. With retakes, 33/37 have passed at this point for a 89% pass rate. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to successfully pass after graduation. |

| **Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care** |
| passing score as determined by the NBRC |
| **Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| Thirty-seven seniors attempted the exam with 28/37 or 76% passing on the first attempt. With retakes, 33/37 have passed at this point for a 89% pass rate. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to successfully pass after graduation. |

| **M 3: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 2, 5, 6)** |
| 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met** |
| Fourteen of 36 seniors passed on first attempt for a 39% first-time pass rate. Re-takes bring the total passed to 27 out of 36 for 75% pass rate. These percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to pass the exam. |

| **Target for O5: use of technology** |
| passing score as determined by the NBRC |
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fourteen of 36 seniors passed on first attempt for a 39% first-time pass rate. Re-takes bring the total passed to 27 out of 36 for 75% pass rate. These percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to pass the exam.

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
passing score as determined by the NBRC

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fourteen of 36 seniors passed on first attempt for a 39% first-time pass rate. Re-takes bring the total passed to 27 out of 36 for 75% pass rate. These percentages may change as the remaining students attempt to pass the exam.

M 4: Departmental Exit Exam (O: 2, 5, 6)
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students passed with a 75% or greater score on either the Written RRT exam as administered by the National Board of Respiratory Care or a Self-assessment version of the same exam administered on campus.

Target for O5: use of technology
Score of 75% or greater

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students passed with a 75% or greater score on either the Written RRT exam as administered by the National Board of Respiratory Care or a Self-assessment version of the same exam administered on campus.

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
Score of 75% or greater

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All students passed with a 75% or greater score on either the Written RRT exam as administered by the National Board of Respiratory Care or a Self-assessment version of the same exam administered on campus.

M 5: Employer Survey-Psychomotor (O: 2, 3, 6)
Following graduation from the program, a nationally standardized survey instrument on students' clinical skills is sent to the graduate’s employer.

Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ten (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system and via email. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ten (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system and via email. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Ten (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system and via email. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".

M 6: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor (O: 2, 3, 6)
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 O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Four (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were above 3 on scale of 1-5 on all measures.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Four (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were above 3 on scale of 1-5 on all measures.

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Four (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were above 3 on scale of 1-5 on all measures.

M 7: Summative Psychomotor Evaluation (O: 2, 3, 6)
For program completion, each student must demonstrate adequate clinical skills as rated by an instructor.

Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
38/39 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs. One student received an incomplete due to missed clinical time.

Target for O3: technical performance of advanced skills
Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
38/39 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs. One student received an incomplete due to missed clinical time.

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
38/39 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs. One student received an incomplete due to missed clinical time.

M 8: Employer Survey- Affective (O: 1, 4, 6)
Following graduation, a nationally standardized survey instrument on students' professional behavior is sent to the graduate's employer.

Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Seven (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Seven (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".

Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Seven (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. Scores were 82% for the highest value "5" and 16% for the next highest "4".
Six-months post graduation, students are asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for professional behavior in Respiratory Therapy.

**Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing**
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Six (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. All scores were 3 or higher.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Six (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. All scores were 3 or higher.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Six (out of possible 39) surveys were completed on-line through the DataArc system. All scores were 3 or higher.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All affective evaluations for seniors in RT 4052, Clinical Practice V, were rated as satisfactory.

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 O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills**
This secure exam is given via the Web. Feedback is provided on each content area.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed this self assessment exam at the end of fall 2006 in RT 4051 with the passing score established by the NBRC. Scores ranged from 81 to 113 with average = 93.

**Target for O5: use of technology**
This secure exam is given via the Web. Feedback is provided on each content area.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed this self assessment exam at the end of fall 2006 in RT 4051 with the passing score established by the NBRC. Scores ranged from 81 to 113 with average = 93.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
This secure exam is given via the Web. Feedback is provided on each content area.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students passed this self assessment exam at the end of fall 2006 in RT 4051 with the passing score established by the NBRC. Scores ranged from 81 to 113 with average = 93.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Thirty-nine students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 92%.

**Target for O4: professional behaviors expected of advanced-level**
Students should achieve 85% or higher on written and oral assignments

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Thirty-nine students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 92%.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
Students should achieve 85% or higher on written and oral assignments

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Thirty-nine students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 92%.

**M 13: Mid-Program comprehensive exam (O: 2, 5, 6)**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores ranged from 75 to 92%. Average = 84. All students passed.

**Target for O5: use of technology**
A score of 75% or greater

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores ranged from 75 to 92%. Average = 84. All students passed.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
A score of 75% or greater

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Scores ranged from 75 to 92%. Average = 84. All students passed.

**M 14: NBRC Entry Level CRT (O: 2, 5, 6)**
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**
A passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During Spring 2007, seniors in their last semester of the RT curriculum scored 100% (39/39) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

**Target for O5: use of technology**
A passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During Spring 2007, seniors in their last semester of the RT curriculum scored 100% (39/39) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

**Target for O6: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
A passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During Spring 2007, seniors in their last semester of the RT curriculum scored 100% (39/39) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

**M 15: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 2, 5, 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 O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills**
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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The class of 2007 has 27 of 39 graduates (69%) who earned the RRT credential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: use of technology**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The class of 2007 has 27 of 39 graduates (69%) who earned the RRT credential.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The class of 2007 has 27 of 39 graduates (69%) 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

**Employer Surveys**

Following graduation from the program, nationally standardized survey instruments on students’ clinical and professional skills are evaluated. DataArc, a web-based system has been used the past 2 years with low response. Emailed copies will be used next year to increase response.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Employer Survey- Affective | Outcome/Objective: communication skills both orally and in writing
  - Measure: Employer Survey-Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: technical performance of advanced skills
  - Measure: Employer Survey-Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director (Goodfellow)

**Graduate Surveys**

Six months post graduation graduates are asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for performance of clinical skills and professional behavior. DataArc, a web-based system has been used the past 2 years with low response. Emailed copies will be used next year to increase response.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Graduate Survey-Affective | Outcome/Objective: communication skills both orally and in writing
  - Measure: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: technical performance of advanced skills
  - Measure: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director (Goodfellow)

**NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam**

The NBRC Clinical Simulation exam is another measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures. This exam involves demonstration of higher-level patient management ability, including therapeutic procedure initiation and modification. The past two years students have been given the option to take this exam prior to graduation. For this measure, we will follow this for one more year and then make a decision as a faculty if this option should be a requirement for graduation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
  - Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
  - Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: use of technology
**NBRC Written Registry Exam**

This is a measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken just before graduation, and involves predominantly "application" and "analysis" items. The past two years students have been encouraged to take this exam prior to graduation and if successful, the results were used as the program final. Students were given a choice. For this measure, we will follow this for one more year and then make a decision as a faculty if this option should be a requirement for graduation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Departmental Exit Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
- Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills

**Implementation Description:** May 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty of Respiratory Therapy

**Additional Resources:** Funding to purchase this exam for each student which is $190 per student.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Surveys that were returned either from employers or graduates were very good. In terms of assessing our outcomes or objectives in this regard, the curriculum and clinical practice time provide the necessary rigor to accomplish our goals.

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

The DataARc web-based system did not provide the number of returned surveys needed to make an accurate assessment. Letters were sent to employers, graduates, and essential program personal asking that they go on-line to complete the survey, however, a low turnout was seen. As a last resort to increase response rate, we emailed surveys to employers asking their cooperation.

---

**Georga State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Respiratory Therapy MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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. This is accomplished through our traditional master's track.

**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

**SLO 2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics (M: 1, 2)**

Demonstrate advanced level competence in the use, interpretation, and troubleshooting of advanced ventilatory techniques and cardiopulmonary monitoring

**SLO 3: Technical and scientific communication skills (M: 1, 2)**

Demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills;

**SLO 4: Evaluation of RT literature (M: 2)**

Intensive review of respiratory care literature to prepare for thesis or project

**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

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Currently we have 5 graduate students who are working towards their requirements of a thesis or project. Each has
maintained at least a 3.0 GPA or better in their coursework.

### Target for O2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
Completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Currently we have 5 graduate students who are working towards their requirements of a thesis or project. Each has
maintained at least a 3.0 GPA or better in their coursework.

### Target for O3: Technical and scientific communication skills
Completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Currently we have 5 graduate students who are working towards their requirements of a thesis or project. Each has
maintained at least a 3.0 GPA or better in their coursework.

### M 2: Understanding of advanced topics in RT (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Examinations and projects (grades) from advanced courses in RT master’s core curriculum

#### Target for O2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
Score of at least 85% as graded by the instructor or advisor

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All graduate students enrolled in RT 6030, RT 6040, and/or RT 7090 scored at least 85% or higher.

#### Target for O3: Technical and scientific communication skills
Score of at least 85% as graded by the instructor or advisor

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All graduate students enrolled in RT 6030, RT 6040, and/or RT 7090 scored at least 85% or higher.

#### Target for O4: Evaluation of RT literature
Score of at least 85% as graded by the instructor or advisor

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All graduate students enrolled in RT 6030, RT 6040, and/or RT 7090 scored at least 85% or higher.

#### Target for O5: Understanding Health Policy in the US
meets course requirements

**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 HHS 8000 with 80% or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students met the objective.

### 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

### Implement rubric for evaluating thesis proposals

A rubric will be developed and tested for usability in 07/08 for all thesis proposals.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Demonstrate appreciation of research process  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics  
- **Measure:** Understanding of advanced topics in RT  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics  
- **Evaluation of RT literature | Technical and scientific communication skills**

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director (Goodfellow)

### Integrated bachelor’s to master’s entry RT program

Applicants to our traditional undergraduate program will be encouraged to apply to this new admission option if they already have a bachelor’s degree and have completed all pre-requisites. Will reserve no more than 10 slots in entering class for this admission option.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Understanding of advanced topics in RT  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics  
- **Technical and scientific communication skills**

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty in the Division of Respiratory Therapy

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

RT 7090, Seminar in Respiratory Care, implemented fall 06. This course reviewed newer and emerging technologies specific to the cardiopulmonary system with an emphasis on a more thorough review of the literature. The master’s program is continuing to increase in numbers of students as the number of applications has increased from 9 in fall 2006 to 11 for fall 2007 with 4 integrated masters applications at this time.

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

1. Thesis advising and development  
2. New integrated program will be tested for implementation

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2006-2007 Risk Management & Insurance (Mathematical Risk Management) MS**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: Graduates value the program (M: 2, 8, 10)**

MS-RMI (MRM) graduates value the program.

### 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
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: Understand technical concepts (M: 3, 4, 6, 11)**

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
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: Perform valuations of traded financial assets (M: 3, 6, 11)**

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
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: Quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures (M: 4)**

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
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: Ability to analyze data and construct models (M: 5, 11)**

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: 6, 7, 11)**

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: 11)
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: 6, 11)
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 (M: 9)
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: 1, 2, 10)
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: 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.
period models by introducing stochastic processes with emphasis on Markov chains, Poisson processes, and Brownian motion.

including severity models, frequency models, compound distributions, and aggregate loss models. The second part covers multi—
covers non-life loss models with an introduction to stochastic processes. The first part of the course covers single-period models

each May for the prior academic year. Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of professional competency obtained across various courses. FI 8240 Global Portfolio Management was rated below average.

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.59 on a 5-point scale) in the level of professional competency obtained across various courses. The MRM advisory board met in January 2007 to review the status of the MRM program and to offer advice on two specific topics. First, we reviewed the case studies covered in MRM 8620 and sought advice about what we could do to enhance the value for students. Second, we reviewed the placement strategy for MRM students. Lorilee Schneider (RMI) and Jason Addrich (RCB) discussed activities from their respective organizations. The faculty and administration then received valuable advice from the company representatives. Overall, the Advisory Board found the MRM curriculum to be relevant and MRM graduates to be highly sought after job candidates. In 2006, ten students graduated from the program. All ten people successfully secured jobs. The average starting salary was $72,000 in guaranteed compensation.

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire will be administered by mail to graduating students and alumni who graduated during the previous three years. 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 professional competency obtained across various courses.

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of professional competency obtained across various courses. The Program Director reported overall satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.

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 lattice modeling 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.

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.

At the end of the course, students will have a strong understanding of the economic models of risk and risky decision making, the microeconomic approach to asset valuation in both static and dynamic models, and be able to apply these concepts in more advanced coursework.

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.59 on a 5-point scale) in the level of professional competency obtained across various courses. FI 8240 Global Portfolio Management was rated below average.

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.59 on a 5-point scale) in the level of professional competency obtained across various courses. 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.

The Program Director reported overall satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.
Target for O6: Quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction with student performance on all related coursework related to MRM 8320 course in terms of the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8320 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: There is a problem with the prerequisites. For graduate students, the problem is that some of them do not have the prerequisite mathematical statistics but take the course anyway. They say they would rather take immediately rather than wait a year – the course is only offered once per year. For undergraduates, the problem is that the AS major only requires one semester of mathematical statistics – the second semester is a recommended elective. I have had undergraduate students ask questions about basic math stats topics, indicating how ill-prepared they are. We should probably offer a separate course for AS 4320 rather than crosslisting it with MRM 8320. This would allow more thorough coverage of applications and broader discussion of more complex topics, which now get slighted because of the undergraduate students. In the fall 2006 semester 21 graduate students and 22 undergraduates completed the course. In general the graduate students performed very well and the undergraduates less well. Here is the grade distribution for graduate students: 14 students received an “A” grade, 6 students received a “B” grade, and 1 student received a “C” grade.

M 6: Student performance in MRM 8610 (O: 4, 5, 8, 10)

Evaluation of student performance related to MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: There is a problem with the prerequisites. For graduate students, the problem is that some of them do not have the prerequisite mathematical statistics but take the course anyway. They say they would rather take immediately rather than wait a year – the course is only offered once per year. For undergraduates, the problem is that the AS major only requires one semester of mathematical statistics – the second semester is a recommended elective. I have had undergraduate students ask questions about basic math stats topics, indicating how ill-prepared they are. We should probably offer a separate course for AS 4320 rather than crosslisting it with MRM 8320. This would allow more thorough coverage of applications and broader discussion of more complex topics, which now get slighted because of the undergraduate students.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very well. Here is the grade distribution: 22 students received an “A” grade, 6 students received a “B” grade, and 1 student received a “C” grade.

Target for O7: Ability to analyze data and construct models

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction with student performance on all related coursework related to Econ 8750 and Econ 8780, in terms of the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8320 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: There is a problem with the prerequisites. For graduate students, the problem is that some of them do not have the prerequisite mathematical statistics but take the course anyway. They say they would rather take immediately rather than wait a year – the course is only offered once per year. For undergraduates, the problem is that the AS major only requires one semester of mathematical statistics – the second semester is a recommended elective. I have had undergraduate students ask questions about basic math stats topics, indicating how ill-prepared they are. We should probably offer a separate course for AS 4320 rather than crosslisting it with MRM 8320. This would allow more thorough coverage of applications and broader discussion of more complex topics, which now get slighted because of the undergraduate students. In the fall 2006 semester 21 graduate students and 22 undergraduates completed the course. In general the graduate students performed very well and the undergraduates less well. Here is the grade distribution for graduate students: 14 students received an “A” grade, 6 students received a “B” grade, and 1 student received a “C” grade.

M 5: Student performance in Econ 8750 and 8780 (O: 7)

Evaluation of student performance related to Econ 8750 Econometrics and Econ 8780 Financial Econometrics will be completed each May for the prior academic year. Econ 8750 is a required course for students of the MRM program. It provides a study of linear econometric methods. Subjects cover the classical linear regression model, generalized least squares, and an introduction to a symtotic distribution theory. Topics such as maximum likelihood testing, specification testing, violations of the classical assumption, and dichotomous choice models will be examined. ECON 8780 is also required for students of the MRM program. It provides 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).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8320 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very well. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received a “A” grade, 1 student received an “A-” grade, and 3 students received “B+” grades.

M 6: Student performance in MRM 8610 (O: 4, 5, 8, 10)

Evaluation of student performance related to MRM 8610 Introduction to Financial Engineering will be completed each May for the prior academic year. MRM 8610 is required for MRM and MAS programs. This course introduces students to continuous-time financial models essential for the practice of mathematical risk management. It emphasizes the fundamental mathematical tools from continuous-time stochastic processes including Ito’s formula, change of measure, and martingales.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very well. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received a “A” grade, 1 student received an “A-” grade, and 3 students received “B+” grades.

Target for O4: Understand technical concepts

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8610, in terms of the specified learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very well. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received a “A” grade, 1 student received an “A-” grade, and 3 students received “B+” grades.

Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8610, in terms of the specified learning outcomes.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very well. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received a “A” grade, 1 student received an “A-” grade, and 3 students received “B+” grades.
course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 6 are MRM students, and 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received “A” grades, 1 student received an “A-“ and 3 students received “B+” grades.

**Target for O8: Construct and value financially engineered assets**

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8610, in terms of the specified learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 6 are MRM students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received “A” grades, 1 student received an “A-“ and 3 students received “B+” grades.

**Target for O10: Communicate mathematical and statistical analyses**

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8610, in terms of the specified learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The following MRM 8610 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Samuel Cox, who taught the course: This spring 29 students completed the course. Of these 20 are MAS students, 6 are MRM students, 2 are MBA students, and 1 is an RMI PhD student. This semester was very successful. The class was large, but they were willing to work hard, and participate in class. We covered the entire syllabus, including a multiple factor stock and bond market model. I have not covered so much in earlier semesters. The main reason is that I spent very little time on discrete time models since they have seen these in prerequisite classes. In the past, there are always a significant number who did not have the prerequisites. We started almost immediately with Brownian motion. In general the students performed very. Here is the grade distribution for MRM students: 2 students received “A” grades, 1 student received an “A-“ and 3 students received “B+” grades.

**M 7: Student performance in MRM 8630 (O: 8)**

Evaluation of student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8630 Stochastic Interest Rate and Credit Models will be completed each May for the prior academic year. MRM 8630 provides a detailed study of pricing of interest rate securities based on stochastic term structure models. A review of stochastic calculus is given; short rate and HJM models are introduced, developed and compared; finally credit risky securities are studied.

**Target for O8: Construct and value financially engineered assets**

The Program Director will report satisfaction in student performance on all MRM 8630 Stochastic Interest Rate and Credit Models coursework relevant to the specified learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The Program Director reported overall satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8630 Stochastic Interest Rate and Credit Models.

**M 8: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (O: 3)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered by mail to graduating students and alumni who graduated during the previous three years. 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 specified program attributes.

**Target for O3: Graduates value the program**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various specified program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.22 on a 5-point scale) with all of the specified program attributes. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 9: MRM faculty review of program (O: 1)**

The faculty teaching in the MRM program will meet every May to review the MRM course assessment reports and to discuss the status of the MRM program. A summary of the meeting and of other principal assessment activities will be provided by the MRM Program Director.

**Target for O1: Faculty find program rigorous and current**

Faculty will find the MRM program to be academically rigorous, relevant to our constituencies, and valuable to students and graduates.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Faculty will find the MRM program to be academically rigorous, relevant to our constituencies, and valuable to students and graduates.
The faculty teaching in the MRM program met earlier today to review the MRM course assessment reports and to discuss the current status of the MRM program. A summary of the meeting and of other principal assessment activities during the year are as follows:

1. Ten students graduated from the MRM program in 2006. All ten people successfully secured jobs with an average starting salary of $72,000 in guaranteed compensation.
2. Survey results suggest that graduating students/alumni highly value the core courses in the MRM program and they highly value the program as a whole. All principal courses as well as the overall program received scores of 4.0 or better. In addition, student placement was strong as more employers sought our students than we have students. 3. A number of suggestions were put forth following our review of the course assessments:
   a. No longer offer MRM 8320 and AS 4320 as cross listed courses. The number of graduate and undergraduate students is too large and the two different groups of students need to cover the material at a different pace.
   b. Now that MRM 8320 will be taught as a stand-alone course, we should revise the syllabus to put topics relevant for both MRM and MAS students in MRM 8320, and move insurance specific applications into the follow-on course AS 8430 (e.g., credibility theory). This change will reduce the exam topics covered in MRM 8320 and increase that focus in AS 8430.  
   c. It is desirable to have the students in the revised MRM 8320 do some empirical exercises to bring the theory a bit more alive. A good exercise would be MLE or Method of Moments with insured or credit loss data. This would also better sequence students into MRM 8620.  
   d. We should add a VBA exercise into MRM 8600 to introduce programming concepts. This change will also better sequence students into MRM 8620.  
   e. MRM 8610 needs a textbook that has better treatment of continuous time financial mathematics. Possible texts included Shreve, Wilmott, or Meucci.  
   f. A question was raised whether the switch in texts from Stulz to MacDonald was a good choice for RMI 8370. It was also noted that the MBA students do not have enough background material to take the course unless they have also had Fi 8200. Finally, the question was raised whether an entire semester-long course is needed for MRM students or if the students could see the case studies in some other course. The MRM Program Director will follow up with the relevant faculty for input and a recommendation will be made to GPC in the fall 2008 semester.
3. It was noted that although the applications are different, there are a couple of common topics in Econ 8780 and MRM 8620. Closer coordination between the instructors in the two courses was suggested.

M 10: Alumni Survey - Career Preparation/Opportunities (O: 2, 3)

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered by mail to graduating students and alumni who graduated during the previous three years. 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 the extent to which participants feel that the program has prepared them for or enhanced a career in mathematical risk management.

Target for O2: Employers recruit MRM graduates

Graduating students and alumni will report that the program has prepared them for and enhanced their careers (an average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Graduating students and alumni reported being highly prepared for their careers (mean = 4.20 on a 5-point scale), and that the program enhanced their career opportunities to a high degree (mean = 4.40).

Target for O3: Graduates value the program

Graduating students and alumni will report that the program has prepared them for and enhanced their careers (an average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

Graduating students and alumni reported being highly prepared for their careers (mean = 4.20 on a 5-point scale), and that the program enhanced their career opportunities to a high degree (mean = 4.40).

M 11: Student performance in MRM 8620 (O: 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10)

Evaluation of student performance on all course work relevant to MRM 8620 Financial Risk Models will be completed by the teaching faculty member each May or June for the prior academic year. MRM 8620 – Financial Risk Models is a core part of the MRM program that many MAS and some PhD students also elect to take. It generally fits into the second semester of the MRM program. Building on the foundation laid in the Theory of Risk Sharing (MRM 8600) and Financial Engineering (MRM 8610), this course introduces key models designed to allow managers of financial institutions to measure and manage risks associated with equity markets, interest-rate changes, credit, and other forms of financial risk. The overall approach centers on measuring the overall risk exposure of a firm-wide portfolio to a variety of rare, but plausible, market events. As such, the models treat not only the risks of one market at a time but also the risks associated with many markets moving in simultaneously unfavorable ways. The course emphasizes 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 and techniques learned in the course 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.

Target for O4: Understand technical concepts

The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all MRM 8620 coursework relevant to the specified learning outcome(s).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

The following MRM 8620 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Adam Speight, who taught the course. The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets
The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all MRM 8620 coursework relevant to the specified learning outcome(s).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The following MRM 8620 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Adam Speight, who taught the course: The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Target for O7: Ability to analyze data and construct models**

The following MRM 8620 Evaluation Report was submitted to the MRM Program Director by Dr. Adam Speight, who taught the course: The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Target for O8: Construct and value financially engineered assets**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Target for O9: Make recommendations about firm’s risk exposures**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.

**Target for O10: Communicate mathematical and statistical analyses**

The students performed well both as individuals and as a group. While many students have very strong technical backgrounds, there is significant diversity in the skills and backgrounds of the class as a whole. The details of implementing the “hands on” part of the course was particularly challenging for several students who did not enter the course with a strong background in probabilistic modeling, statistical inference, or computer programming. These students worked hard to bolster the needed skills as they bought theory and method to bear on their biweekly projects. The hard work of these students became obvious as the sophistication of their work progressed throughout the semester. Most students also performed well and made good progress in another important aspect of the course: Clear communication of technical work. From the first assignment, students were given guidance and feedback on how to present goals, assumptions, and results in a concise and meaningful way.
## 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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

**Increase the number of MRM majors**

The RMI Department would like to increase its number of MRM majors. During the annual review process, the MRM teaching faculty discussed ways to increase the number of applicants to the program. Some ideas that may be implemented include:

1. Make sure our Google web exposure is high.
2. Add our name to Wilmott's list.
3. Targeted advertising in appropriate math, physics, and actuarial science newsletters and publications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

**MRM curriculum revisions**

The MRM program director and teaching faculty will consider the following curriculum revisions:

1. Adding a VBA exercise into MRM 8600 Theory of Risk Sharing to introduce programming concepts earlier. This change will also better sequence students into MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling.
2. A new textbook is needed for MRM 8610 Financial Engineering that has better treatment of continuous time financial mathematics. Possible texts included Shreve, Wilmott, or Meucci.
3. Regarding RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management, a question was raised whether the switch in texts from Stulz to MacDonald was a good choice. It was also noted that the MBA students do not have enough background material to take the course unless they have also had Fi 8200 Derivative Markets I. Finally, the question was raised whether an entire semester-long course is needed for MRM students or if the students could see the case studies in some other course. The MRM Program Director will follow up with the relevant faculty for input and a recommendation will be made to GPC in the fall 2008 semester.
4. It was noted that although the applications are different, there are a couple of common topics in Econ 8780 Financial Econometrics and MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling. Closer coordination between the instructors in the two courses was suggested.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Offer MRM 8320 as a stand-alone course

Currently, the undergraduate course AS 4320 Introduction to Stochastic Risk Management Models is cross listed with the graduate course MRM 8320 Stochastic Models. The courses are taught jointly, with different coursework requirements for each group of students. This arrangement presents a problem as graduate students tend to significantly outperform undergraduate students, who typically have a narrower knowledge base and learn at a slower pace. Separating the two courses would allow more thorough coverage of applications in MRM 8320 and an expanded discussion of complex topics. The MRM program director and teaching faculty have decided the following: a. No longer offer MRM 8320 and AS 4320 as cross listed courses. The number of graduate and undergraduate students is too large and the two different groups of students need to cover the material at a different pace. b. The MRM 8320 syllabus will be revised to include topics relevant for both MRM and MAS students, moving insurance-specific applications (e.g., credibility theory) into the follow-on course AS 8430 Life Contingencies. This change will reduce the actuarial exam topics covered in MRM 8320 and increase that focus in AS 8430. c. It is desirable to have the students in the revised MRM 8320 do some empirical exercises to bring the theory a bit more alive. A good exercise would be MLE or Method of Moments with insured or credit loss data. This would also better sequence students into MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling.

Topics of discussion for MRM Advisory Board mtg.

Topics that will be discussed during the next meeting of the MRM Advisory Board include: 1. Ask the company representatives to discuss interesting cases from their companies and see if they would be willing/able to provide data that can help us to build a case for use in class. 2. Have a roundtable discussion of the managerial aspects of successful ERM implementations. What were the success drivers? What are the pitfalls? How were the systems built? Top-down or bottom-up? Who championed the system in their firm?

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The MRM Program is fast becoming one of the RMI Department's strongest, in terms of academics, its relevance to potential employers, and its appeal to graduate students. Last year, MS-RMI students (including MRM) had the highest average GMAT scores of any major in the Robinson College at 640. Ten students graduated from the program in December 2006, all of whom successfully secured jobs within two months of graduation. The average starting salary was $72,000 in guaranteed compensation. Like previous years, more employers sought our graduates than we had graduating students. We have a plan for further increasing the number of students in our program, as described in the Action Items section of this report. Survey results revealed that graduating students and alumni highly value the core courses in the MRM program and they highly value the program as a whole. All principal courses as well as the overall program received scores of 4.0 or better. The only major change in the program this year was our plan to further emphasize the development of students' oral and written communication skills. We did so by asking the student's to give professional presentations about what they did on their summer internships.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The primary weakness of the program is our ability to attract highly qualified students. We should increase the number of students graduating from 8-12 per year to 15-20 per year. Having a larger program will allow us to better meet the demands of the firms seeking our students. We have several items we plan to implement during the next year to increase our visibility with potential students including advertising on Financial Engineering Network, continuing to update the MRM website, and networking through targeted newsletters. There are a few minor curriculum changes we would also like to make including: 1. The course MRM 8320 Stochastic Risk Management Models must undergo major revision as follows: (1) the undergraduate course AS 4320 will no longer be cross listed with MRM 8320; (2) MRM 8320 syllabus will be revised to include topics relevant to both MAS and MRM students; and (3) MRM 8320 will include some empirical exercises (e.g., MLE or Method of Moments with insured or credit loss data). 2. Add a VBA exercise to the coursework required in MRM 8600 to introduce programming concepts earlier in the program. 3. MRM 8610 needs a textbook that has better treatment of continuous time financial mathematics. 4. Closer coordination between the instructors in Econ 8780 and MRM 8620 is needed. The MRM Advisory Board will need to address the following topics during the January 2008 meeting: (1) company representatives will be asked to discuss interesting cases from their companies and, hopefully, they are willing/able to provide data that will help us build a case study for use in class; (2) have a roundtable discussion of the managerial aspects of
successful ERM implementations.
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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 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.

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: 5, 6)
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: 5, 6)
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: 6)
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, 6)**
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: 2, 3, 4)**
MS-RMI (R&I) graduates value the program.

**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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Relevance to employers (M: 1, 2, 3)**
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, 3)**
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 (M: 2, 3)**
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...
An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Results follow below. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel agreed unanimously that the MS-RMI program meets employer needs. One panel member mentioned an interest in additional focus on specialty risks and reinsurance. Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our graduate students upon graduation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Results follow below. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel agreed unanimously that the MS-RMI program meets employer needs. One panel member mentioned an interest in additional focus on specialty risks and reinsurance. Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our graduate students upon graduation.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Results follow below. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel agreed unanimously that the MS-RMI program meets employer needs. One panel member mentioned an interest in additional focus on specialty risks and reinsurance. Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our graduate students upon graduation.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Results follow below. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel agreed unanimously that the MS-RMI program meets employer needs. One panel member mentioned an interest in additional focus on specialty risks and reinsurance. Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our graduate students upon graduation.

**M 2: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency (O: 1, 2, 4, 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 O1: Relevance to employers**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than or equal to 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than or equal to 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O4: Relevance to various stakeholders**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than or equal to 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than or equal to 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses. >>SURVEY RESULTS
M 3: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes (O: 1, 2, 4, 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 O1: Relevance to employers**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.52 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.52 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O4: Relevance to various stakeholders**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.52 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.52 on a 5-point scale) with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 4: 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**

Graduating students and alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) with various university, college, and department services.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Graduating students and alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.16 on a 5-point scale) with a variety of specified university, college, and department services. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 5: Student performance in RMI 8000 (O: 3, 5, 6, 8)

Evaluation of student performance on coursework in RMI 8000 Perspectives on Risk and Insurance will be completed each May for the prior academic year. This foundation course presents the economic principles underpinning risk and insurance and introduces key risk and insurance concepts and practices. The causes of change in risk management and insurance are examined through exploration of relevant physical, technological, cultural, regulatory, and other environmental perspectives.

**Target for O3: Structure and solve problems**

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Although RMI 8000 was once considered one of the MS-RMI's foundation courses, it has not been offered during the past two academic years, and is being phased out of the curriculum. It will be replaced with one or more completely new courses that will measure the learning outcomes specified for this course. The new courses will hopefully be offered starting in the Fall 2009 semester. Many of the topics covered in RMI 8000 are now covered in RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.

**Target for O5: Identify and articulate sources of risk**

The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Although RMI 8000 was once considered one of the MS-RMI's foundation courses, it has not been offered during the past two
academic years, and is being phased out of the curriculum. It will be replaced with one or more completely new courses that will measure the learning outcomes specified for this course. The new courses will hopefully be offered starting in the Fall 2009 semester. Many of the topics covered in RMI 8000 are now covered in RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Recommend risk management approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Although RMI 8000 was once considered one of the MS-RMI's foundation courses, it has not been offered during the past two academic years, and is being phased out of the curriculum. It will be replaced with one or more completely new courses that will measure the learning outcomes specified for this course. The new courses will hopefully be offered starting in the Fall 2009 semester. Many of the topics covered in RMI 8000 are now covered in RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective professional oral/written communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Although RMI 8000 was once considered one of the MS-RMI's foundation courses, it has not been offered during the past two academic years, and is being phased out of the curriculum. It will be replaced with one or more completely new courses that will measure the learning outcomes specified for this course. The new courses will hopefully be offered starting in the Fall 2009 semester. Many of the topics covered in RMI 8000 are now covered in RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Student performance in RMI 8050 (O: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling (e.g., exercises and examinations, case studies, writing assignments, and project presentations) will be completed each May for the prior academic year. RMI 8050 is a spreadsheet-based course that surveys the principles of probability theory and mathematical finance for solving a diverse set of risk management problems related to the valuation and measurement of operational and financial risk exposures of the firm. The course is designed for all students interested in risk management and its application in finance, accounting, strategic management and economics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Structure and solve problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider - RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling assessment I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (although student evaluations of the course are not yet complete as of this writing, students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 for difficulty). By the end of the course, students were generally able to develop spreadsheet models for the simulations of insurance risk, credit risk, interest rate risk, equity risk as well as combinations of risks. They could find point estimates for a variety of probability distributions, as well as estimate means, standard deviations and other meaningful parameters. They learned to calculate Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data, and used it to assess magnitude of risk in a variety of financial situations. Writing requirements were met in a satisfactory manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Identify and articulate sources of risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider - RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling assessment I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (although student evaluations of the course are not yet complete as of this writing, students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 for difficulty). By the end of the course, students were generally able to develop spreadsheet models for the simulations of insurance risk, credit risk, interest rate risk, equity risk as well as combinations of risks. They could find point estimates for a variety of probability distributions, as well as estimate means, standard deviations and other meaningful parameters. They learned to calculate Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data, and used it to assess magnitude of risk in a variety of financial situations. Writing requirements were met in a satisfactory manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Recommend risk management approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider - RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling assessment I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (although student evaluations of the course are not yet complete as of this writing, students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 for difficulty). By the end of the course, students were generally able to develop spreadsheet models for the simulations of insurance risk, credit risk, interest rate risk, equity risk as well as combinations of risks. They could find point estimates for a variety of probability distributions, as well as estimate means, standard deviations and other meaningful parameters. They learned to calculate Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data, and used it to assess magnitude of risk in a variety of financial situations. Writing requirements were met in a satisfactory manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Quantify risk exposures and make recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider - RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling assessment I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (although student evaluations of the course are not yet complete as of this writing, students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 for difficulty). By the end of the course, students were generally able to develop spreadsheet models for the simulations of insurance risk, credit risk, interest rate risk, equity risk as well as combinations of risks. They could find point estimates for a variety of probability distributions, as well as estimate means, standard deviations and other meaningful parameters. They learned to calculate Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data, and used it to assess magnitude of risk in a variety of financial situations. Writing requirements were met in a satisfactory manner.
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
  - 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
- Implementation Description: February 1, 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: William Feldhaus

Curriculum Revision of RMI Graduate Programs
The Department of Risk Management and Insurance is engaged in a major revision of the MS-RMI degree program. This revision should be completed in Fall 2007. The Advisory Committee will play a key role in evaluating the suitability of this revision to our MS-RMI program. A part of this revision is the creation of a capstone course - RMI 8400 Contemporary Issues in Risk Management. This course will be case oriented, and will focus on solving complex risk management problems. Critical thinking, risk assessment and problem solving will be a major component of this course, with group work and presentations of their findings and recommendations. This course will be critical in assessing the knowledge, skills and capabilities of our MS-RMI graduates. We also hope that these curriculum revisions will better integrate actuarial science and RMI graduate students, as well as lead to an increased number of RMI graduates.
Improvement of program services

Survey and interview data reveals that there continues to be some lack of satisfaction with non-academic services (student labs, placement activities, etc.). We will continue to work with the appropriate college and university personnel to make improvements in this area.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
  | Graduates value the program | Relevance to employers | Relevance to various stakeholders
  | Graduates value the program | Relevance to employers | Relevance to various stakeholders
  | Measure: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
  | Graduates value the program | Relevance to employers | Relevance to various stakeholders
  | Graduates value the program | Relevance to employers | Relevance to various stakeholders
  | Measure: Alumni Survey - Student Services | Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program
  | 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?
1. Last year, the MS-RMI program was the second largest specialized master's program in the Robinson College (Accounting being the largest).
2. Excellent qualifications of our incoming students. Last year, MS-RMI students had the highest average GMAT scores (average=640) of any department in the Robinson College.
3. Strong analytical component to the curriculum.
4. Significant improvement in the communication skills of our students, as measured by projects, group tasks and presentations.
5. Good success at placement of our graduates.
5. An industry panel comprised of representatives from all of the major areas of risk management was convened to assess the program's contributions to risk management education and its relevance to potential employers of our students. Panelists reported that the program is indeed relevant to their needs and that employers find our students appealing as potential employees with their firms.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
1. Numbers of current RMI graduate students needs to be higher.
2. Lack of integration of our actuarial science and risk management graduate students.
3. Lack of non-academic services (student labs, etc.) for our MS-RMI students.

Georgia State University
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(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: Effective verbal communication (M: 3, 5, 6, 7)
Our graduates will be able to speak effectively and to articulate their ideas one-on-one and in group settings.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 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

SLO 4: Identification of risky situations (M: 5, 6, 7)
Students will be able to recognize uncertainty and its impact on individual, business, and societal decision making.

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

SLO 5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions (M: 5, 6, 7)
Students will employ ethical decision practices in situations of certainty and uncertainty, regardless of analytical solutions calculated.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Oral Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

SLO 6: Effective problem structuring (M: 5, 6, 7)
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and determine the: (1) nature of the problem(s) to be solved; (2) mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving; and (3) the appropriate use of the tools for solving.

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

SLO 7: Effective problem solving (M: 5, 6, 7)
Students will be able to find accurate solutions to problems involving uncertainty, and use these solutions in decision making, while also employing common sense of the limitations of the problem-solving tools used.

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

SLO 8: Effective written communication (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students will be able to communicate their ideas effectively in writing and structure business correspondence that is both meaningful and technically proficient.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication--major
5 Collaboration--major
7 Critical Thinking--major
13 Technology--major

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Relevance to employers (M: 1, 2)
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)
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)**

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel concurred, with the exception of one member, that the BBA-RMI program meets employer needs in every area except one. All concurred that BBA students do not write as effectively as employers would like. The one dissenter also thought the program to be "headed in too much of a quantitative direction for our needs." Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our BBA-RMI graduates.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

An industry panel of eight representatives from six companies that hire RMI graduates met in Spring 2007 to evaluate both the BBA-RMI and the MS-RMI programs simultaneously. Companies represented: AIG, Aon, Federated, KPMG Advisory, Marsh and Zurich. Relevance of program to meet employer needs: The panel concurred, with the exception of one member, that the BBA-RMI program meets employer needs in every area except one. All concurred that BBA students do not write as effectively as employers would like. The one dissenter also thought the program to be "headed in too much of a quantitative direction for our needs." Interest in hiring graduates of the program: The panel agreed unanimously that they are interested in hiring our BBA-RMI graduates.

**M 2: 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 above average satisfaction (average score higher than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the program contributed to career competency across various knowledge and skill areas.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the extent to which the program contributed to their career competency across various knowledge areas (mean = 3.59) and skill areas (mean = 3.90). >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score higher than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which the program contributed to career competency across various knowledge and skill areas.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the extent to which the program contributed to their career competency across various knowledge areas (mean = 3.59) and skill areas (mean = 3.90). >>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 3: Senior course presentations (O: 3)**

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 both informational and persuasive as the students select and debate their positions on a business issue based on research conducted.
## Target for O3: Effective verbal communication
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on course presentations.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The program is satisfied with student performance on course presentations. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

## M 4: Senior course writing requirements (O: 8)
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 O8: Effective written communication
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on course writing requirements.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. The program director reported that grades, overall, indicate that target levels were met in this area and she is satisfied with student performance.

## M 5: Faculty Survey (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
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: Effective verbal communication
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.

### Target for O4: Identification of risky situations
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.

### Target for O5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.

### Target for O6: Effective problem structuring
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.

### Target for O7: Effective problem solving
Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.
The program director will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty respondents and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels in other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O4: Identification of risky situations**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence in half of the respondents (71/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty respondents and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels in other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence in half of the respondents (71/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Program Director concurs with these assessments. Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty respondents and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels in other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O3: Effective verbal communication**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence among half of the respondents (71/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels in other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O6: Effective written communication**

Faculty will report satisfaction with the level of student achievement on the program's learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily, according to faculty, in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication.” Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Faculty responses also reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills.
& choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Program Director concurs with these assessments.

Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty responses and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels for other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O6: Effective problem structuring**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program’s learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Program Director concurs with these assessments.

Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty responses and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels for other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O7: Effective problem solving**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily in the BBA-RMI curriculum, with a couple of noteworthy exceptions – “ability & choice to make ethical business decisions” and “effective written communication”. BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program’s learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions”. Student grades did not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving” in every course, but met target levels for the program overall. Identification/Assessment of Risky Situations: Performance in senior-level courses was satisfactory, in terms of students’ abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations; RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met expectations, according to student grades on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: Graduating student responses to program survey indicate lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students’ choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Program Director concurs with these assessments.

Effective Problem Structuring: Graduating students as well as faculty respondents indicate satisfaction with student abilities to structure problems overall (all but one respondent answered “agree or strongly agree”). Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured, problems. Student grades in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150E, an experimental and highly mathematical course as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Faculty responses and student grades reflect difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades in RMI 4150E, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350E do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving”, but met target levels for other major courses. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300 and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Additionally, RMI 4350E was utilized for this purpose in 2006-2007. Grades, overall, indicated that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Graduating students and faculty agreed that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O8: Effective written communication**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance on assignments and exams, across the stated learning outcomes.
M 7: Graduating Student Survey (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

On an annual basis, a questionnaire will be administered to graduating students. The questions will survey student attitudes toward the content of the program, especially as it relates to the stated outcomes.

**Target for O3: Effective verbal communication**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of "ability & choice to make ethical business decisions." responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to conduct business decisions. Faculty survey respondents indicated lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path if faced with a dilemma. Program Director concurs with these assessments.

**Target for O4: Identification of risky situations**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of "ability & choice to make ethical business decisions." responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.

**Target for O5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of "ability & choice to make ethical business decisions." responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.

**Target for O6: Effective problem structuring**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of "ability & choice to make ethical business decisions." responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.

**Target for O7: Effective problem solving**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of "ability & choice to make ethical business decisions." responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.
Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions.” Responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.

**Target for 08: Effective written communication**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated learning outcomes, as reported by the Program Director.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

BBA-RMI graduating students expressed satisfaction with the program's learning outcomes in all areas with the exception of “ability and choice to make ethical business decisions.” Responses to program survey indicated a general lack of confidence among half of the respondents (7/14) in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Graduating students specifically expressed satisfaction with their ability to recognize uncertainty in decision situations as well as their ability to structure and effectively solve problems.

### 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
- **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
- **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
- **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

#### Revisions to BBA-RMI curriculum

We plan to do the following in the upcoming academic year to improve these objective areas: (1) Spend more course time in each course on the ethics of decision making; (2) increase the rigor of our major courses in the areas of problem solving and written communication; (3) Continue to increase writing requirements across the curriculum. It is important to note that the RMI Department proposed a change of curriculum for our majors that passed the Undergraduate Program Council of RCB as well as the RCB faculty
The changes, if implemented, are expected to increase the analytical rigor of the program significantly, as well as increase the amount and rigor of writing requirements.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions  
- **Effective problem solving | Effective written communication**  
- **Measure:** Graduating Student Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions  
- **Effective problem solving | Effective written communication**  
- **Measure:** Senior RMI assessments within coursework | **Outcome/Objective:** Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions  
- **Effective problem solving | Effective written communication**

**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 outcomes/objectives?**

Results of the learning outcomes assessment reflect overall program strength in the areas of risk assessment, problem structuring, and verbal communication. We will continue to reinforce these areas of strength. RMI courses across the undergraduate curriculum were revised to increase the use of technology when completing coursework (i.e., Microsoft Excel and other specialized computer applications, online research, specialized research databases, etc.). RMI faculty members that teach in the BBA-RMI program were interviewed for this assessment report and their perspectives regarding achievement of the program's learning outcomes were included across several measures. An industry panel comprised of representatives from all of the major areas of risk management was convened to assess the program's contributions to risk management education and its relevance to potential employers of our students. Panelists reported that the program is indeed relevant to their needs and that employers find our students appealing as potential employees with their firms.

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

Mixed results were obtained in the objectives related to problem solving and written communication effectiveness. Results reflect a general failure to meet target levels for ethical decision making. We hope to address these weaknesses with several planned changes to the curriculum.

---
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#### 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
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning (M: 16)**

Students will exhibit a positive attitude toward continual learning upon completion of the BBA program.

**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

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

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.

Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.75 with a normal distribution

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.75 with a normal distribution

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.75 with a normal distribution

M 5: Material Presentation – Audience (O: 1, 3, 4)
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.

Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.9 with a normal distribution

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.9 with a normal distribution

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Students’ average score was 5.9 with a normal distribution

M 6: Ability to Use Technology (O: 2)
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

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.

**M 7: Ability to Manage Technology (O: 2)**

To what extent did the BBA program enhance students’ ability to manage technology.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.

**M 8: Computer Software Usage – Written (O: 1, 2, 4)**

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.

**Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score was 5.67 with a normal distribution.

**M 9: Computer Software Usage – Oral Presentation (O: 1, 2, 4)**

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.

**Target for O1: Effective Communication Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score on this item was 6.44 with a distribution the having a long left tail.

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score on this item was 6.44 with a distribution the having a long left tail.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Students’ average score on this item was 6.44 with a distribution the having a long left tail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Ability to Think Critically (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to think critically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Ability to Define Problems (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the BBA program enhances students’ ability to define problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Ability to Solve Problems (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Ability to Analyze and Interpret Data (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to analyze and interpret data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to work in teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 deliverables. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Effective Team Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale score of five or higher with low variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ average score was 6.2 with a right skew to the distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The data for this finding will be reported by Educational Benchmarking in August of 2007 based on the Exit surveys of December 2006 and Spring 2007 graduating seniors.

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

#### Developing Expert-Based Measures for Tech Skills

Measures of student technology skills need to be redeveloped based on measures created by the Business Communication and Computer Information System faculty members. These rubrics will then be usable in different venues for measurement of student skills. This should be developed in conjunction with Action Item Number 1.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Ability to Manage Technology | Outcome/Objective: Effective Use of Computer Technology
  - Measure: Ability to Use Technology | Outcome/Objective: Effective Use of Computer Technology
  - Measure: Computer Software Usage -- Oral Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Effective Use of Computer Technology
  - Measure: Computer Software Usage -- Written | Outcome/Objective: Effective Use of Computer Technology
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College Assessment Committee

#### Develop New Measures for Objective 5

A new measure is needed to complement the student self-assessment measure that is currently being used as the only measure for Objective 5.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Further Education -- Self Report | Outcome/Objective: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College Assessment Committee

#### Linkage of Measurements 3, 10, 11, & 12 to CTW

These four measures link tightly with the development of required Critical thinking Through Writing course in the Robinson College. These measures could be very effectively re-directed to those classes. Further, the three Measures that are now relying on student self-reports could be replaced by instructor evaluations along well defined rubrics.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Ability to Define Problems | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical Skills
  - Measure: Ability to Solve Problems | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical Skills
  - Measure: Ability to Think Critically | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical Skills
  - Measure: Synthesizing, Arranging & Presenting -- Written | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical Skills
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College Assessment Committee

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Overall Analysis: The overall assessment showed some encouraging results with respect to the Robinson College's undergraduate program. These results were largely consistent with the results that were produced in the 2005-2006 cycle. Overall the assessment process shows the continuing need for a higher level of sophistication in measurement to enable better assessment of Objectives Analysis of Objective One: Effective Communication Skills The communication skills measures are strong in both the EBI self-assessments and the measures of group performance. Until these measures are replaced with individual, student-level measures, although the results from the 2005-2006 assessment were consistent with the 2006-2007 assessment, the results were very high on the group evaluations. Analysis of Objective Four: Effective Team Membership The students' self-ratings in Measure 14 are not as high relative to the other measures on the EBI exit survey that are used as Measures in this assessment. Further, the results on the one direct measure that focuses exclusively on team functioning shows that in both years, there was a meaningful skew to the distribution, although the mean was at a desired level. Analysis of Objective Five: Appreciation of Life-long Learning. This single self-report measure is consistent with students that are instilled with an appreciation for continuing their formal education.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Overall Analysis: Analysis of the methods and the insights gained by the findings show that there is a need for improvement in the methodology if we are to better understand areas of strengths and weaknesses in student skills. In particular, the analysis does not take adequate individual student measures on many of the indicators. These group performance measures will have to be replaced. Second, many of the results suggest that refinement of the measures needs to be done to increase their rigor. Analysis of Objective One: Effective Communication Skills There are some challenges that we face before drawing strong, positive conclusions about student performance here. Most importantly, Measures 4, 5, 8, and 9 are taken on the group level. This masks some poorer students’ performance. Because groups are of 3 to 4 members, the extent to which individual student weaknesses are being masked may be significant. Analysis of Objective Two: Effective Use of Computer Technology Here too the two measures of actual student performance are based on group outcomes. While this may be highly positive on the evaluations, it does not provide insight on the distribution of individual student skills. Another concern here is that the evaluations of computer skills are done by faculty members who are not members of the business communication or computer information systems faculties. There so not appear to be clear rubrics developed to guide the evaluations of the work products that students produce for the faculty members doing the evaluations. Analysis of Objective Three: Effective Analytical Skills The results suggest that these measures’ (Measures 3, 4, and 5) rubrics need to be reviewed so that when they are transferred to individual-level measures the standards are sufficiently high. Analysis of Objective Four: Effective Team Membership Measure 15 has to be converted to an individual student level. This will likely show that continued improvement in team skills are needed. Analysis of Objective Five: Appreciation of Life-long Learning. Life-long learning is a broader concept and there should be other measures developed so that students’ level of intellectual curiosity could be measured as a part of there overall attitudes toward their learning tasks. The addition of such a measure to the self-report measure will better round out this Objective and allow for a better measure of the extent to which a bias for knowledge searching is instilled in the students.
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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
### 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.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Average score was 5.8 with a normal distribution an no scores below 4.0

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Average score was 5.8 with a normal distribution an no scores below 4.0

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Score of 3.55 with a heavy concentration on 3 and a few outliers to the high side.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Score of 3.55 with a heavy concentration on 3 and a few outliers to the high side.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Score of 3.9 with a normal distribution.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

Score of 3.9 with a normal distribution.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 5.2 with no scores lower than 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 5.2 with no scores lower than 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

### Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 3.9 with a tight distribution and a few high end outliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 3.9 with a tight distribution and a few high end outliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 6: Recommendation 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’ recommendation integrated ethical dimensions in the business decision process.

### Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 3.8 with a tight distribution and a few high end outliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score of 3.8 with a tight distribution and a few high end outliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: Developed and defended business/corporate strategy (O: 1, 2)
Students developed and defended business/corporate strategy in a global and culturally diverse environment. 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: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 8: Identification of Critical Success Factors (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 assess and diagnose organizational performance by identifying the critical success factors in a business.

### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
### Findings 2006-2007

**Target: Met**

Score of 5.0 with a normal distribution.

**Target: Not Met**

Score of 4.4 with a wide but normal distribution relative to other items.

**Target: Met**

Score of 5.2 with a normal distribution.

**Target: Not Met**

Score of 4.6 with an extremely wide distribution having close to 50% of the ratings at either 7 or 1.

**Target: Met**

Score of 5.1 with normal distribution.
### Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Score of 5.1 with normal distribution.

### Target for O3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Score of 5.1 with normal distribution.

### Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Score of 5.1 with normal distribution.

### 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
  - Measure: Functional Expertise Contributions | Outcome/Objective: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
  - 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
  - Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
  - Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
  - Measure: Recommendation integrated ethical dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
  - Measure: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
  - Measure: Recommendation integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Implementation Description:** March 1, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** William C. Bogner
- **Additional Resources:** Time and people

#### Increase Inclusion of Ethical & CSR Aspects
Dimensions of business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and economic sustainability need to be incorporated into courses across the MBA program. This can be done by seeing the cases and other class material raise and discuss this material and tie effective decision making in this area to good management.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **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
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

All of the Objectives for the part-time MBA program had measures showing both supportive and non-supportive results. There were some measures that were not yet employed. Of the measures that were employed all suffered from the limitation of being drawn from a single venue and project and from the group level of analysis that was used. Within these limitations some areas of strength and progress can be identified. Each Objective is discussed these respects below. Objective One: Creative Decision Making Skills: Students scored well on their ability to do analysis and make recommendations on the functional level (Measures 1 and 4). Objective Two Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organizational Performance: Here two students were able to do analysis and make recommendations on the functional level (Measures 1 and 4). They also were able to identify Critical Success Factors (Measure 9) and do an effective analysis of the firm's Industry Environment (Measure 10). Objective Three: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team: Here there is little evidence that this is a strength of the program other than an indication that students make functional contributions to their group projects (Measure 13) Objective Four: Development of Leadership Skills: As with the third objective, there is little evidence that this is a strength of the program other than an indication that students make functional contributions to their group projects (Measure 13).
The current measurement techniques have two flaws. First, the level of analysis is incorrect and has to be corrected at once. Second, some of the measures are not currently in use. These measures must find venues. Going forward, this portion of the analysis will suggest that Action Plan items need to be addressed in terms of both the content and the measurement of the objectives. Objective One: Creative Decision Making Skills: Students do not meet the targets set out for the analysis of the global and ethical dimensions of decision making (Measures 2 and 3) or do they meet the targets for the recommendations on these same two dimensions (Measures 5 and 6). The measure of an integrated strategy on all dimensions was not measured (Measure 7). Objective Two Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organizational Performance: As with objective one, the students were not able to meet the targets for the global and ethical dimensions of decision making (Measures 2 and 3) or recommendations (Measures 5 and 6). Students also did not meet the desired level of capability in assessing the resources and capabilities of a firm (Measure 9). Objective Three: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team: The primary measure here (Measure 12) shows that in not meeting the target of productive performance there was a very wide distribution of scores from evaluating instructors. As this was on a group level the expectation is that there exists a high level of within group variation in capability as well. Objective Four: Development of Leadership Skills: As with the third objective the analysis of Measure 12 shows bi-polar performance. A further Measure that could inform this objective (Measure 11) was not measured.
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### Mission / Purpose

The doctoral program of the Robinson College of Business 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.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Comprehensive understanding of subject (M: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12)**

Full Description: 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.

**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: Mastery of methodology (M: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12)**

Students are expected to have a firm grasp of quantitative and research methodology, including statistics, regression, research design and multivariate data analysis.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Competency in research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12)**

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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Teaching excellence (M: 1, 3, 10, 11)**

Students 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 refined.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience
- 6.7.1 Financial Support

**O/O 5: Professional Development and Academic Community Pa (M: 1, 5, 6, 12)**

Students are expected to participate in discipline-specific association meetings through attendance and presentation of scholarly papers. Students are expected to do publishable research with faculty and colleagues.

**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

**O/O 6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institutions (M: 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12)**
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 are expected to produce a thoughtful and well-researched dissertation. Once placed, alumni should remain active researchers.

**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: Performance in seminar coursework (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
All 9000 level academic unit seminars to be used as major coursework.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% earned B- or better.

**Target for O3: Competency in research**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% earned B- or better.

**Target for O4: Teaching excellence**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% earned B- or better.

**Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Participation**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% earned B- or better.

**Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institutions**
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% earned B- or better.

**M 2: Comprehensive examinations (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The examination is designed to determine mastery of the major area and to include subject matter covered in the quantitative and research methods breadth requirement of the program. This examination is to be taken upon completion of coursework. 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.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**
At least 80% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
87.5% - Eight students took their comprehensives during the last year. Seven passed on the first attempt. One student failed the first attempt and passed on the second attempt.

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**
At least 80% of students should pass on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.5% - Eight students took their comprehensives during the last year. Seven passed on the first attempt. One student failed the first attempt and passed on the second attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Competency in research**

At least 80% of students should pass on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.5% - Eight students took their comprehensives during the last year. Seven passed on the first attempt. One student failed the first attempt and passed on the second attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

The Doctoral Program Office, in collaboration with the academic unit, will evaluate each student in the following areas: a) academic progress b) ability to satisfactorily perform research and teaching assignments c) demonstrated ability to do original and collaborative research d) mastery of quantitative and computer skills e) academic integrity f) timely progress in the program

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**

Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the last year, of the 123 students that were in the program, 22 successfully graduated out of the program, six students were counseled out of the Ph.D. program and two students decided to leave the program for personal reasons. Four students were past the seven-year time limit and had to petition for an extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**

Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the last year, of the 123 students that were in the program, 22 successfully graduated out of the program, six students were counseled out of the Ph.D. program and two students decided to leave the program for personal reasons. Four students were past the seven-year time limit and had to petition for an extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Competency in research**

Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the last year, of the 123 students that were in the program, 22 successfully graduated out of the program, six students were counseled out of the Ph.D. program and two students decided to leave the program for personal reasons. Four students were past the seven-year time limit and had to petition for an extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Teaching excellence**

Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the last year, of the 123 students that were in the program, 22 successfully graduated out of the program, six students were counseled out of the Ph.D. program and two students decided to leave the program for personal reasons. Four students were past the seven-year time limit and had to petition for an extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Performance in research methodology courses (O: 2, 3)**

The following courses were reviewed: MGS 9920 - PROB & STAT THEORY I MGS 9930 - PROB & STAT THEORY II MGS 9940 - RESEARCH DESIGN MGS 9950 - REGRESSION ANALYSIS MGS 9960 - MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**

At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses met target except MGS 9950, which had a 88% B- or better rate; and MGS 9960, which had a 57% B- or better rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Competency in research**

At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses met target except MGS 9950, which had a 88% B- or better rate; and MGS 9960, which had a 57% B- or better rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Collaborative research (O: 3, 5)**
Students not yet at the dissertation stage should be able actively working on research projects with faculty.

**Target for O3: Competency in research**

All students should be assigned to a research faculty member and engaged in scholarly work on research projects before reaching the dissertation phase.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students not at dissertation stage are actively working as graduate research assistants.

**Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Pa**

All students should be assigned to a research faculty member and engaged in scholarly work on research projects before reaching the dissertation phase.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All students not at dissertation stage are actively working as graduate research assistants.

**M 6: Independent research (O: 3, 5, 6)**

Ability to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research.

**Target for O3: Competency in research**

Students should be learning skills to do original research. This aspect of the program is covered by dissertation research, seminar assignments and unit paper requirements. Students should successfully complete their dissertations within the seven-year time limit of the degree.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Each department has different ways of developing research skills of the student. Some departments require a first year paper. Other departments expect an annual paper. These assignments are in addition to coursework, collaborative research with faculty and dissertation research. The majority of students in the dissertation phase complete their dissertations before the seven year time limit.

**Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Pa**

Students should be learning skills to do original research. This aspect of the program is covered by dissertation research, seminar assignments and unit paper requirements. Students should successfully complete their dissertations within the seven-year time limit of the degree.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Each department has different ways of developing research skills of the student. Some departments require a first year paper. Other departments expect an annual paper. These assignments are in addition to coursework, collaborative research with faculty and dissertation research. The majority of students in the dissertation phase complete their dissertations before the seven year time limit.

**Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented instit**

Students should be learning skills to do original research. This aspect of the program is covered by dissertation research, seminar assignments and unit paper requirements. Students should successfully complete their dissertations within the seven-year time limit of the degree.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Each department has different ways of developing research skills of the student. Some departments require a first year paper. Other departments expect an annual paper. These assignments are in addition to coursework, collaborative research with faculty and dissertation research. The majority of students in the dissertation phase complete their dissertations before the seven year time limit.

**M 7: Dissertation proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The dissertation proposal should include a summary of the following: the purpose of the study; nature of the subject being investigated, its importance; a brief review of the literature; the theory to be developed; the empirical methodology, techniques, and data sources; the nature of the hypotheses to be developed or tested; and a time frame for completion of the dissertation. A unanimous decision by the dissertation committee is required.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**

At least 90% % of students should pass on the first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the thirteen people who had their proposal defense during the last year passed on the first try.

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**

At least 90% % of students should pass on the first attempt.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the thirteen people who had their proposal defense during the last year passed on the first try.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure-Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2006-2007</th>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O3: Competency in research</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>100% of the 22 students successfully defended their dissertations on the first attempt. 86% of these students completed all degree requirements, including the dissertation, within the seven year time limit, the other 14% (three students) had been granted extensions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a grade of S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2: Mastery of methodology</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a grade of S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institutions</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>100% of students received a grade of S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of the thirteen people who had their proposal defense during the last year passed on the first try.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2: Mastery of methodology</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of the thirteen people who had their proposal defense during the last year passed on the first try.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: Competency in research</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of the thirteen people who had their proposal defense during the last year passed on the first try.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: Dissertation final defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The final defense of the dissertation is evaluated by the dissertation committee and defended orally in an open forum. The student should have successfully fulfilled all goals outlined in the dissertation proposal defense. Students should successfully complete their dissertations within the seven-year time limit of the degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Performance graduate research assignments (O: 1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Students with research assignments must register for BA 8510. At the end of the semester, the unit to which the student was assigned issues a grade of S or U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

M 10: Performance in BA 9200 (teaching seminar) (O: 4, 6)
Students are required to take BA 9200, Seminar in Teaching.

Target for O4: Teaching excellence
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented instit
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

M 11: Assessment of Teaching Skills (O: 1, 4, 6)
All students who hold a GTA (graduate teaching assistantship) must be registered for BA 9510. The academic unit will then review the students’ performance. Students will receive either an S or U in BA 9510 based on this review of their teaching.

Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

Target for O4: Teaching excellence
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented instit
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of S.

M 12: Participation at conferences and academic meet (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)
The college promotes the scholarly development of the students by encouraging students to attend conferences and association meetings and to present papers at these venues. The college subsidizes student travel and conference registrations.

Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the current assessment period, 30 students were funded by the doctoral program for scholarly related travel during this assessment period. Students who did not travel during this period of time and who have papers to present will be given preference in the future. During their time in the program, almost all students will be funded for scholarly travel.

Target for O2: Mastery of methodology
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
During the current assessment period, 30 students were funded by the doctoral program for scholarly related travel during this assessment period. Students who did not travel during this period of time and who have papers to present will be given preference in the future. During their time in the program, almost all students will be funded for scholarly travel.

Target for O3: Competency in 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

During the current assessment period, 30 students were funded by the doctoral program for scholarly related travel during this assessment period. Students who did not travel during this period of time and who have papers to present will be given preference in the future. During their time in the program, almost all students will be funded for scholarly travel.

Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Pa

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

During the current assessment period, 30 students were funded by the doctoral program for scholarly related travel during this assessment period. Students who did not travel during this period of time and who have papers to present will be given preference in the future. During their time in the program, almost all students will be funded for scholarly travel.

Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented instit

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met

During the current assessment period, 30 students were funded by the doctoral program for scholarly related travel during this assessment period. Students who did not travel during this period of time and who have papers to present will be given preference in the future. During their time in the program, almost all students will be funded for scholarly travel.

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
- **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
- **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
- **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

**Assessment of methodology coursework**

In light of the poor performance of students in two of the methodology courses, the college will investigate to see if this is a result of inadequate preparation of the student or some other factor. Depending on the results of this investigation, appropriate steps will be taken to improve student performance.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This year we radically changed the format of our assessment to encompass all aspects of our program and to add quantifiable measures. Our findings show that the majority of students in the Robinson Doctoral Program tend to progress through the program on track and finish within the established time limit. They are actively engaged in research and have opportunities to co-author papers and to present scholarly research at association meetings.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
One problem in assessing such a small number of students is that the weaknesses of a very small number significantly affects the statistics. That said, the college feels that it is important to closely monitor student progress. Even though the majority of students stay on track, the college will work more closely with departments to track student progress and to practice early intervention in cases where such action is appropriate. The college is working to have a better online tracking system which is linked to the current university Banner system. Given the results of this assessment, the college will review the methodology courses to determine if students are adequately prepared for the coursework and take steps to rectify any deficiencies.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 School Counseling EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: _______________________
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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a grade of B or better.

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 2006-2007 - 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 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 2006-2007 - 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)**

**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

**Maintain and monitor**

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor student`s grades on projects and other measures used to assess competence. In addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence with regard to the outcomes and objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **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 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. The American School Counselors Association's National Model indicates that program evaluation for accountability purposes is an area that is critical for school counselors. The evaluation of the action research project indicates that the students are learning to successfully evaluate their programs in the schools.

**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. 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.
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Understands career development &amp; life factors (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of career development and related life factors, including career development theories, resources, and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Understands counseling and consultation process (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Understands group purpose for counseling (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Understands individual and group approaches (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of individual and group approaches to assessment and evaluation, including statistical concepts, and selecting, administering, and interpreting appropriate instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Understands educational research methods (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of research methods, statistical analysis, needs assessment, and program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Understands the foundations of school counseling (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Understands contextual dimensions of SCO (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Understands program development (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of program development, implementation, and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance (M: 9, 11, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: Demonstrate skills in consultation (M: 12, 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 11: Understands cultural context (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 12: Understands learners` developmental levels (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 13: Understands professional functioning (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of the students earned an A on the paper.

**M 3: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a grade of A on the intervention.

**M 4: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned 80% or higher on the quizzes and 100% of the students earned at least 86% on the final test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Group Prospectus (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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: • Data collected to perform the needs assessment • A brief introduction to the problem being addressed, with a analysis of relevant data and a concise purpose statement • A review of relevant literature related to the goals of the strategy • A rationale for the structure of your group, including your theoretical orientation, group format, and group membership. • Group Organization (screening process, length of sessions/group, evaluation procedures) • Discussion of potential issues around diversity and ethical considerations • References • An appendix with an outline of content/exercises, handouts, release forms, and evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Understands group purpose for counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better for the prospectus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned an A on the group prospectus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Closing the Gap Project (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5:</strong> Understands educational research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Comprehensive test in CPS 6020/6030 (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6:</strong> Understands the foundations of school counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the comprehensive test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Closing the Gap Project (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8:</strong> Understands program development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Site Supr’s Eval of Individual Counseling Skills (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site supervisor will evaluate the student on the following individual counseling skills: structures 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 close techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9:</strong> Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will be rated highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

95% of the students were rated highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

### M 10: 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 by their on-site supervisor at the highly effective or effective level.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of the students were rated by their on-site supervisor at the highly effective or effective level.

### M 11: 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 highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

91% of the students were rated highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

### M 12: 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 the combined quizzes.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

95% of the students earned a grade of B or better on the combined quizzes.

### M 13: 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 highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

90% of the students were rated highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

### M 14: Case Study in Appraisal (O: 4)


**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a grade of A on the case study.

### M 15: 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 highly effective or effective on all of the skills listed.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
M 16: Project on Individual Development (O: 12)

“My Lifespan” Project A central theme of this course is that the student entering the profession needs to be prepared for understanding lifespan development, and the first step toward that goal is the identification and clarification of one’s own development. For each lifespan developmental stage that you have lived (Infancy, Early childhood, Middle childhood, Adolescence, Early adulthood, Middle adulthood, and Late Adulthood) you will discuss: A. The overall developmental occurrences, events, and surprises at that stage: Here you provide a complete description of. B. What developmental events did you have which were expected. C. What developmental events did you not have which would have been expected. D. What non-developmental events did you have that were not expected. B. Role of this developmental step on your subsequent development: Here you tell me how what happened at this developmental stage affected you subsequent development and led to you being who you now are. I am not looking for a psychological profile or a deep “tell all” paper of your “life long struggles.” I am simply looking for the physical, cognitive, and psychosocial milestones and events that you encountered, or did not encounter, and how your lifespan journey compares with the expected lifespan development as taught in this course. Be creative and feel free to include drawing, photos, etc. If you do not have information for a certain stage, give me what would be expected and your best guess on what you encountered at that point.

Target for O12: Understands learners’ developmental levels

At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the project.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met

100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the project.

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

Maintain and monitor

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor student’s grades on projects, tests and other measures used to assess competence. In addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence. Because we depend upon practicing school counselors to contribute to the practical experience of our students in the schools, we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of the site and site supervisors. The evaluation completed by the on-site supervisors after the fall semester will be used by the faculty supervisor to help the student develop any areas that are not rated highly effective or effective.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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 that includes community resources. 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 that includes community resources.

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, although two students (10%) received lower ratings than students received last year on an evaluation by their on-site supervisor. Faculty supervisors will monitor student’s formative assessments by on-site supervisors to help students with specific skills that need to be developed. Course content and requirements are revised in accordance with new expectations for school counselors as suggested by the accrediting agencies cited. We are initiating a new course this year that will specifically address advocacy, leadership, and action research in the schools that we believe will make the program stronger. In addition, we continue to evaluate the on-site supervisors where students are placed for their practicum/internship experience so that our students learn about a developmentally appropriate, preventive school counseling program from a school counselor who models the attitudes and behaviors that we expect of our students.
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
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
3.2 Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
3.3 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
1.3 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: 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
1.3 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 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
1.3 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: 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
1.3 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 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.

**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 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

**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 8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

**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 9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.

**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 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.

**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 11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively.

**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

**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 supervisors’ 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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.
100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 100% (15) of the students in practicum passed all elements of the portfolio. |

**M 2: Supervisor Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**
Internship supervisor’s rate the students’ skill and acquisition of primary school psychology skills across the identified objectives of the program.

**Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O5: Understands diversity re: development & learning**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O6: Understands School Organization, Policy & Climate**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |

**Target for O9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.

| Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met | 92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor. |
92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor.

**Target for O10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor.

**Target for O11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology**
80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
92% of students obtained acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by the internship supervisor.

**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 supervisor’s rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students achieved a passing score on all elements of the 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS_related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS_related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS_related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS_related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS_related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
At least 90% of all students rated a satisfactory or better on the STARS-related faculty end of program survey.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
**devolve 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
  - 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 & Climate
  - Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.
  - Understands Socialization and Life Competencies

**Measure:** Internship Portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
  - 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 & Climate
  - Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.
  - Understands Socialization and Life Competencies

**Measure:** Practicum Portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
  - 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 & Climate
  - Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.
  - Understands Socialization and Life Competencies

**Measure:** Supervisor Rating
- **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
  - 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 & Climate
  - Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.
  - Understands Socialization and Life Competencies

**Implementation Description:** 9/2006 to 5/2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Steve Truscott
**Additional Resources:** Department has assigned a part-time GRA to help with this.

### 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
Establish more careful review of transfer credits
Analyses indicate that one specific transfer student was unprepared for internship and resulted in the program falling short of some end of program objectives. In particular, her assessment and language skills were not sufficient for independent practice. She will repeat substantial elements of the program. A primary issue is that we accepted training from another program that does not meet our standards. As such, we have instituted a careful review process for any transfer credits that involves program faculty review of syllabi and student skills before transfer credits are approved. This was not the case previously.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: Immediately
Responsible Person/Group: Program 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?
We had one student who failed internship and will be required to re-take the courses along with several prerequisite courses. The student was a transfer student and an English language learner. Our assessment is that we should have done a better job of evaluating her skills and language capabilities prior to accepting her transfer credits.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Overall, our program outcomes/objectives are fine. The student was identified by the system of checks based on program goals/objectives. Her remedial program contains a series of checks on progress. As a program, we will be much more careful about transfer courses in the future.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
The GSU school psychology program continues to meet expectation and provide superior training. We had one international student who transferred in several key courses from another University. The student had difficulties on internship related to these transfer
Courses and some language issues. We have instituted a more rigorous review of transfer courses to prevent such occurrences in the future and devised a remedial plan for the student. Otherwise, the program is in very good condition, enrollment is up, national ranking is up (currently 7th in research productivity), external funds are up.

**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.

**Highlights**

Ranked 7th in Research productivity among school psychology programs nationally. Enrollment is up, yet we are getting most of our top admissions picks (17 accepts for 20 admits last year) 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 enrollment places demands on faculty time.

**Teaching Activities**

Teaching ranks high in importance. All faculty teach in the program.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**

see accomplishments

**Public/Community Service**

Students provide 22,000 hours of service to local districts. Faculty provide consultation to local districts. Faculty and students serve on national committees

**International Activities**

Varjas is working in Sri Lanka and India. Cadenhead is working in Mexico and began cross cultural studies class there this year.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 School Psychology PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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. 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 2: Use and Conduct Research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Graduates use and conduct research.

Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

**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: 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 subspecialty that strengthens their skills as psychologists.
Relevant Associations: APA and NASP

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All program graduates have found positions that are appropriate for the degree

Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All program graduates have found positions that are appropriate for the degree

Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All program graduates have found positions that are appropriate for the degree

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All program graduates have found positions that are appropriate for the degree

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
All program graduates have found positions that are appropriate for the degree

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
all students who completed comprehensive exam this year had previously passed predissertation requirement (n = 2)

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One student defended dissertation this year.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
2 students passed comprehensive exam this year.

Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
2 students passed comprehensive exam this year.

Target for O4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych.
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
2 students passed comprehensive exam this year.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
3 students completed all coursework, including the cognate this year.

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
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 EdS enrollment places demands on faculty time. Change 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

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 progress. New attention to speeding up that progress is beginning to be exhibited in mid-level PhD student progress

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Progress for students who have been here for some time remains slower than hoped for. Continued effort in this area is warranted.
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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Science Education MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: Knows and can apply modern science content (M: 10)**

Teachers of science understand and can articulate the knowledge and practices of contemporary science. They can interrelate and interpret important concepts, ideas, and applications in their fields of licensure; and can conduct scientific investigations.

**O/O 2: Engages learners in the nature of Science (M: 1)**

Teachers of science engage students effectively in studies of the history, philosophy, and practice of science. They enable students to distinguish science from nonscience, understand the evolution and practice of science as a human endeavor, and critically analyze assertions made in the name of science.

**O/O 3: Can engage learners in inquiry (M: 2)**

 Teachers of science engage students both in studies of various methods of scientific inquiry and in active learning through scientific inquiry. They encourage students, individually and collaboratively, to observe, ask questions, design inquiries, and collect and interpret data in order to develop concepts and relationships from empirical experiences.

**O/O 4: Understand issues in science and technology (M: 3)**

Teachers of science recognize that informed citizens must be prepared to make decisions and take action on contemporary science-and-technology-related issues of interest to the general society. They require students to conduct inquiries into the factual basis of such issues and to assess possible actions and outcomes based upon their goals and values.

**O/O 5: Has effective teaching skills for science (M: 4)**

Teachers of science create a community of diverse learners who construct meaning from their science experiences and possess a disposition for further exploration and learning. They use, and can justify, a variety of classroom arrangements, groupings, actions, strategies, and methodologies.

**O/O 6: Can plan and implement science curriculum (M: 5)**

Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching.

**O/O 7: Promotes science in the community (M: 6)**

Teachers of science relate their discipline to their local and regional communities, involving stakeholders and using the individual, institutional, and natural resources of the community in their teaching. They actively engage students in science-related studies or activities related to locally important issues.

**O/O 8: Constructs and uses assessments effectively (M: 7)**

Teachers of science construct and use effective assessment strategies to determine the backgrounds and achievements of learners and facilitate their intellectual, social, and personal development. They assess students fairly and equitably, and require that students engage in ongoing self-assessment.

**O/O 9: Promotes learners’ safety and welfare (M: 8)**

Teachers of science organize safe and effective learning environments that promote the success of students and the welfare of all living things. They require and promote knowledge and respect for safety, and oversee the welfare of all living things used in the classroom or found in the field.

**O/O 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, 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 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 O2: Engages learners in the nature of Science**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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 exceeds 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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, 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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 elements, 3 indicates that 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 ‘4’ or higher’ on element rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## M 5: Portfolio element: Research Paper (O: 6)

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.

### Target for O6: Can plan and implement science curriculum
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

### M 6: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan (O: 7)
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 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 O7: Promotes science in the community
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ’2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of 2 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

### M 7: Portfolio component: SSI lesson plan (assessment) (O: 8)
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. 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 O8: Constructs and uses assessments effectively
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of 2 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of 3 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

### M 8: Portfolio Element: Safety Certification (O: 9)
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.

### Target for O9: Promotes learners` safety and welfare
90% of teacher candidates will attend and successfully complete the safety certification workshop.

**Findings** 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of 2 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

### M 9: Professional Growth Plan (O: 10)
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 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.

**Target for O10: Strives for continuous professional growth**
90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**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:Curriculum Exploration/Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Engages learners in the nature of Science
- 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

**Pk-12 involvement**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve the engagement of pk-12 faculty to provide their input in the program design during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Professional Growth Plan | Outcome/Objective: Strives for continuous professional growth

Implementation Description: February 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Science Education faculty

**Providing diverse experiences in the program**
Our student population comprises of in-service teachers that may be working with a specific student population. We need to formalize ways of providing diverse learning experiences to our students and collect data on this process.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Professional Growth Plan | Outcome/Objective: Strives for continuous professional growth

Implementation Description: February 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Science education faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
The assessment data allowed us to examine student performance in the program as they completed various assessments and met the NSTA standards successfully. The professional portfolio component allowed the students (in-service teachers) to critically examine their progress in the program and argue for their professional growth and learning.

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

Data indicated that we need to address two issues as we continue to examine our programs: 1. How do we provide diverse experiences to our students (in-service teachers) as they may already be working with homogenous school setting. The program assessments need to be revised to help us meet this goal. 2. Get input and feedback from our pk-12 stakeholders as we continue to provide professional development experiences in the program so that students'(in-service teachers') experiences align with the realities of the classroom.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Science Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

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 their intellectual, social and personal development.

O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)
The teacher understands how students different in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

O/O 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)
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.

O/O 10: School and Community Involvement (M: 10)
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: 1)
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 O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.7 with a standard deviation of 0.52.

### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
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 O2: Understands student development re: learning**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 2: Understands student development regarding learning. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.49.

### M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
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 O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 3: Effectively teach diverse groups of learners. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 0.51.

### M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
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 O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
88% of candidates met Standard 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 0.71.

### M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)
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 O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning**
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 2006-2007 - Target:**
100% of candidates met Standard 5: Can motivate and manage student learning. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.82.

### M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 6)
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 O6: Uses communication skills and technology**

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 2006-2007 - Target:**

100% of candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.51.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 7)**

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 O7: Can effectively plan for instruction**

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 2006-2007 - Target:**

100% of all candidates met Standard 7: Can effectively plan for instruction. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.60.

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 8)**

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 O8: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

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 2006-2007 - Target:**

100% of candidates met Standard 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.64.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 9)**

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 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 2006-2007 - Target:**

100% of all candidates met Standard 9: Practices professional reflection. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.4 with a standard deviation of 0.57.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 10)**

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 O10: School and Community Involvement**

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 2006-2007 - Target:**

100% of candidates met Standard 10: School and Community Involvement. Faculty scored students using this measure on a 5 point scale with 5 being outstanding. The average score is 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.62.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on...
The high standards the MSIT science education department has for its majors are reflected in the high performance target levels set for our learning outcomes assessment measures. All students met target performance levels on 9 of the 10 assessment measures. The professional portfolio component allowed the students to critically examine their progress in the program and argue for their professional growth and learning.

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

The assessment data indicates a need to address two areas as we continue to examine the TEEMS program. Two of our nontraditional students, who were teaching full time, were challenged with Standard 4: knows and uses multiple instructional strategies. We expect that implementing action #3 and #4 will improve these performance levels. While we have managed to place students in diverse field settings, the field placement process is not formalized. One of our goals for next year is to put in place a formal process for placing students into diverse settings for data reporting as discussed in action #2.

**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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates and applies critical perspectives (M: 1)**

The student demonstrates understandings of 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

**SLO 2: Demonstrates and applies normative perspectives (M: 2)**

The student demonstrates understandings 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

**SLO 3: Designs and conducts research (M: 3)**

The student demonstrates the ability to design a major research study (MS project or thesis), 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: 1)**

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 O1: Demonstrates and applies critical perspectives
95% of critical analysis essays will achieve a rating of 2 or higher, as evaluated by program faculty in EPSF 7110, 8310 & 8040 & 8270.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Six students exceeded outcomes based upon the following assignments: philosophy positions, analytical essay, midterm essay, and critical book review.

M 2: Issues-related research papers (O: 2)
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 met 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 O2: Demonstrates and applies normative perspectives
95% of issues-related research papers will achieve a rating of 2 or higher, as evaluated by program faculty in EPSF 7110, 7120, & 8280.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Four students exceeded outcomes based upon an evaluation of ethnographic data, an interview paper, and a lesson plan.

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".

Target for O3: Designs and conducts research
95 percent will meet or exceed expectations.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One student exceeded the measure.

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
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Foundations program faculty

**Maintenance and Management of Data**
The LOA reporting system will be improved through the development of a spreadsheet for centralizing all of the student data for long-term collection and evaluation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Foundations Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our students exceeded the three named outcomes/objectives. We will monitor and maintain current levels of performance.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We will improve the reporting structure for long-term data collection and evaluation.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% for our one completer demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**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

Portfolio Outcomes
Evaluate whether the new online portfolio meets the objectives and measures the learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

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: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies MEd faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All students met expectations on each learning outcome. The faculty successfully instructed, mentored, and positively impacted the learning experience for the one graduate.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The new portfolio will need evaluation to ensure the same high level standards are achieved.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Social Studies Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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. Quality professional programs
2. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. 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. Quality professional programs
1. Global, cultural perspectives
3. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6. 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

#### 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
### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

97.78% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Analysis of Alternative Models of Field Experience
Over the next year, TEEMS 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 collaboration 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 10 | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
- 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 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

Findings 2005-2006 - Target: Met
95.71% of our 30 completers demonstrated at or above the 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 demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.
The Mission of the BSW Program is to prepare entry-level, generalist social workers to assume responsibility for a range of services...

**M  a i n t a i n  C o n t i n u i t y  o f  I n s t r u c t i o n**

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

**R e l a t i o n s h i p s  (M e a s u r e  |  O u t c o m e / O b j e c t i v e :)**

- **Measure:** Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 10
- **Outcome/Objective:** Involves school and community in learning
- **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

**I m p r o v e  s t u d e n t  p e r f o r m a n c e**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

**R e l a t i o n s h i p s  (M e a s u r e  |  O u t c o m e / O b j e c t i v e :)**

- **Measure:** Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 10
- **Outcome/Objective:** Involves school and community in learning
- **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: August 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Joseph Feinberg and other TEEMS social studies faculty.

**A n a l y s i s  Q u e s t i o n s  a n d  A n a l y s i s  A n s w e r s**

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

On all of the outcomes, at least 95% of the students met expectations. Increased collaboration and communication among TEEMS social studies faculty were several specific steps that were taken this year. In addition, faculty revised the TEEMS portfolio, updated syllabi, and are collaborating to streamline the program further. Faculty will strive to improve in all areas and provide continued attention through instruction and assessment in order to enhance student awareness of the program’s objectives and standards.

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

Although we met the target performance levels for all of the objectives, minor improvements could be initiated to work towards achieving 100% in all areas.
that deal with the problems experienced by people in a multicultural society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action (M: 3, 5, 11, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through the gathering of client information and formulating, in collaboration with the client, a plan of action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics (M: 1, 6, 7, 8, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations (M: 10, 12, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate written communication skills through research and position papers in subject areas affecting vulnerable populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Written Communication: Social Work (M: 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate written communication skills specific to social work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Oral Communication: Field Based (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate oral communication skills through the completion of a class presentation on their respective field agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice (M: 5, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate oral communication skills specific to social work practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Oral Communication--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Collaboration: Case Planning (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate collaboration skills through case planning with clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Collaboration: Social Agencies (M: 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate collaboration skills through partnering with other social agencies on behalf of their clients during field internships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Collaboration--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate critical thinking through the development of testable hypotheses and interpreting and analyzing data related to client and system problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning (M: 4, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through a personal examination of the experiential learning in field education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Critical Thinking--major
### SLO 11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related (M: 8, 14, 16)

Students demonstrate understanding of contemporary issues through the integration of the theories of the larger social environment on individuals, families, and communities

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

### SLO 12: Contemporary Issues: Legislative (M: 14)

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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9 Contemporary Issues--major

### SLO 13: Quantitative Skills: Evidenced Based Practice (M: 9, 15)

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, 15, 16, 17)

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, 14, 15, 16, 17)

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

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 19, 20)**

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: 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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

93% of students achieved 90% or higher rating on this sub scale.

#### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

82% of students received a B or higher on the assignment

**Target for O7: Collaboration: Case Planning**

90% of students receive B or higher on assignment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: SW 3730 Social Work Practice II (O: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82% of students received a B or higher on the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: SW 4930: Field Education Seminar (O: 5, 8, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82% of students received a B or higher on the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: SW 3610 Communication Skills in Social Work (O: 1, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of students received a B or higher on the assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: SW 4930 &amp; 4940 Field Education (O: 2, 8, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2006-2007 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% received a Good or excellent on these field internship evaluation items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% received a Good or excellent on these field internship evaluation items.

### Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% received a Good or excellent on these field internship evaluation items.

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received an excellent or good rating.

### Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received an excellent or good rating.

### Target for O6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received an excellent or good rating.

### Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning
95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students received an excellent or good rating.

### M 8: SW 4390 & SW 4940: Field Education (O: 2, 11)
Field Supervisor Evaluation Rating (Section I - Community/Organizational Context of Practice) in field internship

### Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics
90% of students will receive B or higher

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
80% of students received a B or higher - (two out of three sections met target, one section did not)

### Target for O11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related
90% of students will receive B or higher

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
80% of students received a B or higher - (two out of three sections met target, one section did not)

### M 9: SW 3020: Research in Social Work Practice (O: 4, 9, 13, 14, 15)
Final Exam for the course

### Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
57% received a B or higher on the final exam for the course

### Target for O9: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
57% received a B or higher on the final exam for the course
### Target for O13: Quantitative Skills: Evidenced Based Practice
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
57% received a B or higher on the final exam for the course

### Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
57% received a B or higher on the final exam for the course

### Target for O15: Technology
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
57% received a B or higher on the final exam for the course

### M 10: SW 3330 Human Behavior I (O: 3)
Final Paper on Life Course Development

**Target for O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations**
80% of students will receive a B or better

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
67% of students received a B or higher on this assignment

### M 11: 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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
87% received 90% or higher. Two of three sections met target - one section did not

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
90% of students will receive Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
87% received 90% or higher. Two of three sections met target - one section did not

### M 12: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students achieved positive evaluation

**Target for O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations**
Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students achieved positive evaluation

**Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work**
Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
90% of students achieved positive evaluation

### M 13: 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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
80% of students achieved 80% or higher

**M 14: SW 3930: Social Welfare Policy (O: 11, 12, 15)**
Legislative Analysis assignment

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of students achieved 80% or higher - (93% in one section and 32% in a second section)

**Target for O12: Contemporary Issues: Legislative**
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of students achieved 80% or higher - (93% in one section and 32% in a second section)

**Target for O15: Technology**
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
63% of students achieved 80% or higher - (93% in one section and 32% in a second section)

**M 15: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
82% earned a B or higher on the assignments

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
82% earned a B or higher on the assignments

**Target for O15: Technology**
80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
82% earned a B or higher on the assignments

**M 16: 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 on final exam

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students received B or higher on assignment. Goal achieved in two sections, one section missed target.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students received B or higher on assignment. Goal achieved in two sections, one section missed target.

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students received B or higher on assignment. Goal achieved in two sections, one section missed target.

**Target for O15: Technology**
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students achieved goal. Two sections exceeded target goal - one section did not.

**M 17: 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

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students achieved goal. Two sections exceeded target goal - one section did not.

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students achieved goal. Two sections exceeded target goal - one section did not.

**Target for O15: Technology**
90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of students achieved goal. Two sections exceeded target goal - one section did not.

**M 18: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**
54% of students received a B or higher on the final exam of the course

**M 19: BSW Learning Objective #1 (O: 16)**
Students will use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities

**Target for O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90 % of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**M 20: BSW Learning Outcome #12 (O: 16)**
Students will function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems, and seek necessary organizational change.

**Target for O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90 % of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

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

**Admissions Change**
The BSW committee is currently evaluating three possible changes in the admissions process to assess fit with major at the front end of the program

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: SW 3020: Methods of Social Work Research | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations
- Measure: SW 3020: Research in Social Work Practice | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis
Curriculum Modification
A required course (SW 4280) has been resequenced within the curriculum to enhance content integration with practice content and the Field Education Seminar

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 3720 Social Work Practice</td>
<td>Collaboration: Case Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 3730 Social Work Practice II</td>
<td>Critical Thinking: Plan of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 3930: Social Welfare Policy</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues: Legislative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 4390 &amp; SW 4940: Field Education</td>
<td>Collaboration: Values and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 4930 &amp; SW 4940 Field Education Seminar</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues: Theory Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Per the past year assessment, progress was made in the students' journals in field. Student success on this objective was up over last year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There were several objectives where outcome data was poorer than the previous year. In particular, these weaknesses were in the area of critical thinking and synthesis, and writing skills. The two changes in the Action Plan were directly related to the poorer-than-expected performance of the students during this assessment cycle.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Social Work MSW
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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/Organizational Development (M: 6, 11, 12)
Students demonstrate the ability to formulate, maintain, and strengthen relationships and partnerships that build healthy communities.

**SLO 5: 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 6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 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: 6)
Research paper

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met
100% of students received a grade of B or higher

#### M 2: SW 8900 Field Education (O: 6)
Practice intervention paper

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Met
100% of students received a B or higher on the paper

#### M 3: SW 8100 Skills and Techniques of Community Partner (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)
Community Project Proposal papers

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met
88% of students received a B or higher

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met
88% of students received a B or higher

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met
88% of students received a B or higher

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target:** Partially Met
88% of students received a B or higher

#### M 4: SW 8500 and SW 8900 Field Education (O: 3)
Field Instructor Final Evaluation - Section V, on Social Work Skills

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
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: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnerships (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: SW 8500 and 8900 Field Education (O: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive Good or Excellent or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% received a Good or higher on this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: SW 8800 Community project (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or better on this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: SW 8500 and 8900 Field Education (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: SW 8800 Community project (O: 3, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: SW 8200 and SW 8900 (O: 3, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnership (O: 3, 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: SW 8800 Community Partnerships (O: 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: SW 8300 Leadership and Management (O: 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**

90% of students will receive a B or higher on final course grade

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The overall average for the six papers was 93%

**M 14: SW 8900 Field Education (O: 6)**

Final Program Evaluation paper that includes the role of technology in human services

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**

90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a B or higher

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

**Admissions Change**

The MSW committee has stipulated that matriculating students must complete a research methods course prior to admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Measure: | SW 8100 - Skills and Techniques of Community Partner | Outcome/Objective: Research, Evaluation, and Technology |

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Overall, student performance indicated that learning outcomes/objectives were achieved on almost all measures. The one goal that was partially met is addressed by enhancing capability of incoming students on research methods.

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

Students continue to perform well in the program, and the assignments in the courses appear to be valid indicators of student progress.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Sociology BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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
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
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 agggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706(8 sections of 1101 and 7 sections of 1160). In the area
of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92.5% of students in 1101 and 97% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.55% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 (8 sections of 1101 and 7 sections of 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.5% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.55% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.55% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 (8 sections of 1101 and 7 sections of 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.5% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.55% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**Target for O5: Analytical Skills**

Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 (8 sections of 1101 and 7 sections of 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.5% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 827 (all sections of 1101 and 1160). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92.55% of students answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 87.3% of students answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 83.3% answered questions correctly.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Among the 92 students whose final exams were evaluated, the median score was 3.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

The median rating of 139 students’ analytic skills was 2.
**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
The median score for 139 students was 2.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 114 students rated in this category was 3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 78 students rated in this category was 3.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 114 students rated in this category was 3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 78 students rated in this category was 3.

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 114 students rated in this category was 3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 78 students rated in this category was 3.

**Target for O5: Analytical Skills**
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 114 students rated in this category was 3.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The median score for the 78 students rated in this category was 3.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
For the 48 students who took a final exam in this course, the median score was 3.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**
The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
For the 48 students who took a final exam in this course, the median score was 3.
Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 48 students who took a final exam in this course, the median score was 3.

Target for O5: Analytical Skills
The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 48 students who took a final exam in this course, the median score was 3.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Among the 92 students in two sections whose papers were evaluated, the median score was 3.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Among the 73 students in two sections whose papers were evaluated, the median score was 3.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 90 students evaluated, the median score was 3.

Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 90 students evaluated, the median score was 3.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 90 students evaluated, the median score was 3.

Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge
The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
For the 90 students evaluated, the median score was 3.

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

1. Those who teach social statistics will continue to struggle with the math-related deficiencies of a significant minority of majors.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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: 2007-08 academic year.
Responsible Person/Group: instructors of 3010

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), inequality (3201), and methods (3010) courses and partially met in statistics (3010).

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Students typically struggle most in our statistics course because it demands mathematical skills. Ideally, all students would do well in this course, 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. It is possible, in fact, that our outcome objective of having all students do well (A or B work) in this course is simply unrealistic.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Sociology MA
As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 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. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Thesis Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters students orally defend their thesis to their thesis committee and other attending faculty members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Analytical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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: 100% of students scored a 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 4 on "The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles;" 100% scored 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 100% scored 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 100% scored 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has articulated key sociological concepts and theories;" 100% scored 4 on "The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 100% scored 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 100% scored 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions." (Note: Three Masters theses were completed between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007. Therefore, the N for each statistic presented above is 3.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - 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: 100% of students scored a 4 (excellent) on "The student has acquired the skills to collect data;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills;" 100% scored 4 on "The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles;" 100% scored 4 on "The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses;" 100% scored 4 on "The student is able to analyze and interpret data;" 100% scored 4 on "The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has articulated key sociological concepts and theories;" 100% scored 4 on "The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems;" 100% scored 4 on "The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings;" 100% scored 4 on "The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems;" and 100% scored 4 on "The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions." (Note: Three Masters theses were completed between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007. Therefore, the N for each statistic presented above is 3.)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

As was the case last year, our assessments show that our Masters-level students are meeting and exceeding our expectations. After last year’s assessment, the department received feedback regarding our assessment of graduate student performance. One
comment addressed the standard to which graduate students are being held. Because the text of some of our skills matches those used for our undergraduate student assessments, it may have looked like we used the same standard to judge our graduate students. To make it clear to faculty conducting the assessments and to outside reviewers judging our assessments, we modified our Learning Outcomes Assessment Form to specify that the student is to be assessed relative to other Masters-level students. The other comment on last year's report asked whether we would want to add other assessments, for example, of student teaching. The faculty discussed whether other assessments were needed. We did not feel that assessing student teaching was necessary or appropriate. First, many of our students do not teach. Second, the department already has a very rigorous Teacher Training Program, and we felt that additional assessments of graduate student teaching were unnecessary given our training program. As a department, we concluded that because graduate student experiences can be so variable, the best and most appropriate assessment opportunity was the final oral defense of the Masters thesis.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
None are necessary.
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With only one PhD degree granted between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007, we easily met and exceeded our target performance level. This one student was rated a "4" (or "excellent") on every one of the thirteen assessment items.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With only one PhD degree granted between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007, we easily met and exceeded our target performance level. This one student was rated a "4" (or "excellent") on every one of the thirteen assessment items.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With only one PhD degree granted between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007, we easily met and exceeded our target performance level. This one student was rated a "4" (or "excellent") on every one of the thirteen assessment items.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With only one PhD degree granted between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007, we easily met and exceeded our target performance level. This one student was rated a "4" (or "excellent") on every one of the thirteen assessment items.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
With only one PhD degree granted between August 1, 2006 and April 25, 2007, we easily met and exceeded our target performance level. This one student was rated a "4" (or "excellent") on every one of the thirteen assessment items.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
As was the case last year, our assessments show that our Doctoral-level students are meeting and exceeding our expectations. After last year’s assessment, the department received feedback regarding our assessment of graduate student performance. One comment addressed the standard to which graduate students are being held. Because the text of some of our skills matches those used for our undergraduate student assessments, it may have looked like we used the same standard to judge our graduate students. To make it clear to faculty conducting the assessments and to outside reviewers judging our assessments, we modified our Learning Outcomes Assessment Form to specify that the student is to be assessed relative to other Doctoral-level students. The other comment on last year’s report asked whether we would want to add other assessments, for example, of student teaching. The faculty discussed whether other assessments were needed. We did not feel that assessing student teaching was necessary or appropriate. First, many of our students do not teach. Second, the department already has a very rigorous Teacher Training Program, and we felt that additional assessments of graduate student teaching were unnecessary given our training program. As a department, we concluded that because graduate student experiences can be so variable, the best and most appropriate assessment opportunity was the final oral defense of the Doctoral dissertation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
None were necessary.
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, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 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: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 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
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: 1, 2, 3, 5, 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: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 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
SLO 5: Reading Spanish (M: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 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 Spanish (M: 3, 4, 6, 7, 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

SLO 7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 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: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 9: Oral proficiency (M: 1, 2, 9, 10, 11)
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, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9)**

All Spanish majors scored 4.76.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**Target for O9: Oral proficiency**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**M 2: Speaking Spanish (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9)**

All Spanish majors scored 4.72.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.
### Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### Target for O4: Speaking Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### Target for O9: Oral proficiency

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

### M3: Reading Spanish (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8)

All Spanish majors scored 4.51.

### Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

### Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Reading Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Writing in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**M 4: Writing Spanish (O: 2, 6, 7, 8)**

All Spanish majors scored 4.63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Writing in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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.

**M 5: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)**

All Spanish majors scored 4.57.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Student completed all aspects of the assignment but may have had a few errors in language or gaps or misunderstanding in...
Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

All Spanish majors scored 4.40.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O6**: Writing in Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O7**: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O8**: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O2**: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O4**: Speaking Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O5**: Reading Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O6**: Writing in Spanish

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

Target for **O7**: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Understanding spoken Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Speaking Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Reading Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Speaking Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.
content requirement) on a scale of 6. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O6: Writing in Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**Target for O9: Oral proficiency**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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. Students have improved significantly since 2005-2006.

**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

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

4 on a scale of 6

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

4 on a scale of 6

**Target for O9: Oral proficiency**

4 on a scale of 6

**M 11: Presentational Communication: Individual oral test (O: 4, 7, 9)**

Presentational Communication is assessed in the Language Acquisition and Research Center (LARC) on the second and last week of classes. The first assignment 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

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
4 on a scale of 6

Target for O9: Oral proficiency
Score of 4 of 6.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Spanish core results are linked here.

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

No action needed at this time.
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.

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

Oral Communication Assessment
Improvement and refinement of instrument and delivery in order to implement in all languages taught at MCL.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Interpersonal communication: Class interaction | Outcome/Objective: Oral proficiency
  | Speaking Spanish | Understanding spoken Spanish
- Measure: Speaking Spanish | Outcome/Objective: Speaking Spanish

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Carmen Schlig

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments show that Spanish majors surpassed the goal of 4.0 in every area except one. They can speak, read and write Spanish at the level described, and their knowledge of hispanophone culture and business practices, and their ability to analyze literary texts, is appropriate for BA candidates. In two areas, knowledge of business and of teaching practices, scores rose considerably over the last year, from 3.11 to 4.23 and 3.11 to 3.83 respectively.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The score of 4.23 in business practices, while meeting the goal and surpassing it slightly, suggests that some majors may be inadequately versed in this area. The overall score of 3.73 on pedagogical practices attained by the French majors preparing to teach does not meet the goal. The Spanish section will attempt to determine if this is an endemic problem, or if the disappointing score was the result of inadequate performance by a small number of students whose results depressed the score.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Spanish MA
As of: 12/13/2016 03:04 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 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: Direct and indirect assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Direct Assessment: 1. M.A. Thesis: The thesis must be original work by the student. The proposal must be approved by faculty members. 2. M.A. Research paper: The aim of this project is for the candidate to apply theoretical concepts to her or his present or
Candidates will present the results of their research in a 12-20 page paper. Candidates have a choice to write the project in either their target language or in English, under the direction of their graduate advisor.

3. M.A. General Examination: After completing all course work for the degree, candidates are required to pass a written and an oral General Examination based on a reading list. Candidates in the literature concentration must be prepared to discuss all the works listed in their chosen areas both individually and in relation to each other and to the period in which they are written. The written exam requires candidates to choose three fields from Spanish reading list. 4. Oral Exam: For the oral examination Spanish candidates are responsible for one additional area of their choice from the reading list, one additional area based on course work taken in culture or literature, and the three areas covered in the written exam. This examination is scheduled 7 to 10 days following successful completion of the written exam. It lasts a minimum of one hour and is conducted by an M.A. Committee. Indirect Assessment: Student evaluations, annual reports, and teaching portfolios are evaluated by the Department’s executive committee.

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2006: 6 Students took the Master’s written and oral examinations and completed a Research Paper, graduating. In recent years candidates who completed their M.A. studies in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages have been accepted in Ph.D. programs around the country. Some graduates from the M.A. in Spanish have attained a doctorate and are currently employed as full time faculty.

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2006: 6 Students took the Master’s written and oral examinations and completed a Research Paper, graduating. In recent years candidates who completed their M.A. studies in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages have been accepted in Ph.D. programs around the country. Some graduates from the M.A. in Spanish have attained a doctorate and are currently employed as full time faculty.

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2006: 6 Students took the Master’s written and oral examinations and completed a Research Paper, graduating. In recent years candidates who completed their M.A. studies in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages have been accepted in Ph.D. programs around the country. Some graduates from the M.A. in Spanish have attained a doctorate and are currently employed as full time faculty.

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.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2006: 6 Students took the Master’s written and oral examinations and completed a Research Paper, graduating. In recent years candidates who completed their M.A. studies in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages have been accepted in Ph.D. programs around the country. Some graduates from the M.A. in Spanish have attained a doctorate and are currently employed as full time faculty.

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

Encourage scholarship
Supervise student work that can be presented at professional meetings.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Direct and indirect assessment | Outcome/Objective: Effective writing, communication and editing |
| Research and data collecting skills |

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

Mentoring
Mentor M.A. candidates who express a desire to continue graduate work at the doctoral level.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Direct and indirect assessment
- Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of knowledge
- Critical thinking skills

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

Professional activities
Encourage and oversee M.A. candidates initiatives (such as the graduate conference) that contribute to student growth and institution visibility.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Direct and indirect assessment
- Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of knowledge
- Effective writing, communication and editing

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Students taking Research Hours report to their supervisor at least three times during the semester. This measure ensures that students spread their work during a period of time rather than turn in one report at the end of the semester.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Speech BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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; 108 major in Speech Communication.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: processes, theories, and research (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 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, 5, 6)

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
- 9 Contemporary Issues--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**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: leadership competencies (M: 1, 3, 6)

Students will possess communication competencies necessary for effective leadership.

**Relevant Associations:** NCA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication--major
- 3 Oral Communication--major
- 5 Collaboration--major
- 7 Critical Thinking--major

**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

### SLO 4: Oral Communication in the core (M: 7)

Students will demonstrate the ability to: 1. Choose and narrows a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion. 2. Communicate the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for audience and occasion. 3. Provide appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion. 4. Use an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion and purpose. 5. Use language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion and purpose. 6. Use vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest. 7. Use pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience. 8. Use physical behaviors that support the verbal message.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Oral 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: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students in Spch 3210 majoring in Speech Communication earned a grade of 70% or better on a technical speech presentation. The evaluation sheet assigned points based upon 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**

7/10 points or better on each of the seven parts of the exam

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

35% of the students earned 7 points or better in content area of Models of Communication. 20% of the students earned 7 points or better in the content area of Public Communication. 0 students earned 7 points or better in the content areas of...
Interpersonal Communication and Language & Communication. 2.5% of students earned 7 points or better in the content area of Diversity. 67% of students earned 7 points or better in the content area of Steps to Write a Research paper. 10% of students earned 7 points 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The scores from three tests from spch 2650, Interpersonal Communication: test 1 - 62% of students scored 70% or higher; test 2 - 76% test 3 - 79%.

**Target for O2: critical skills**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The scores from three tests from spch 2650, Interpersonal Communication: test 1 - 62% of students scored 70% or higher; test 2 - 76% test 3 - 79%.

**Target for O3: leadership competencies**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
The scores from three tests from spch 2650, Interpersonal Communication: test 1 - 62% of students scored 70% or higher; test 2 - 76% test 3 - 79%.

### M 4: research paper (O: 1, 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 O1: processes, theories, and research**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
96% of the students in Spch 4450 earned 70% for the grade on the paper, and 67% of the students earned 70% on the writing instrument rubric. In Spch 4400, 81% of the students earned 70% for the grade on the paper, but only 43% earned 70% on the writing instrument rubric.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
96% of the students in Spch 4450 earned 70% for the grade on the paper, and 67% of the students earned 70% on the writing instrument rubric. In Spch 4400, 81% of the students earned 70% for the grade on the paper, but only 43% earned 70% on the writing instrument rubric.

### M 5: Observation (O: 1, 2)
Students in Spch 4400 Communication Development across the Lifespan will observe children and write a paper connecting their observations to the current theory and research.

**Target for O1: processes, theories, and research**
a grade of 70 out of 100 on the observation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
89% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% for the grade on the observation.

**Target for O2: critical skills**
a grade of 70 out of 100 on the observation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
89% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% for the grade on the observation.

### M 6: Group Research Project (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students in Spch 3050 Communication Research Methods will work in groups throughout the semester to design and carry out an academic research project (e.g., survey, content analysis, etc.). A portion of their grade will be determined by their group
participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: processes, theories, and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a grade of 70/100 on the group project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students in Spch 3050 earned 70% or higher on the group project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: critical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a grade of 70/100 on the group project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students in Spch 3050 earned 70% or higher on the group project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: leadership competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a grade of 70/100 on the group project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students in Spch 3050 earned 70% or higher on the group project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: online and in class assessments in Speech 1000 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As recommended in the 2006 report, we continued to collect data on two measures of communication apprehension through the online component of our custom Speech 1000 textbook in Human Communication. Beginning in fall 2006, we began using a new textbook through Pearson Custom Publishing. As in previous semesters, students completed the PRCA-24 and WTC surveys online. Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 1031 students. The eight performance competencies measured correspond to a universal grading form used in all Speech 1000 sections during the fall 2006 term. Each performance competency was measured on a three-point scale, with 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, and 3 = outstanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Oral Communication in the core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement over 2005-2006 scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are detailed at Speech 1000 assessment results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>exam revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> Fall semester 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Speech Communication faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>implement CCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors will be directed to complete the Competent Communicator Scale for all future presentations used for assessment.</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><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> Fall semester 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Instructors of Spch 3210, Business and Professional Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>implement writing instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors will be directed to complete the writing assessment instrument for all future papers used for assessment.</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><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> Fall semester 06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**exam revision or elimination**

The assessment exam was revised this past year but still may not be testing what is actually being taught in the major courses. Continued discussions about revising the speech major are needed to address this for two main reasons: first, the course material is not consistent across sections; course material varies with the instructors, and second, the faculty is determining what core courses more accurately reflect the learning goals for the speech majors. All curriculum revisions will require continued discussion about the appropriateness of the current goals and objectives for the speech major. The faculty has also discussed possible measures to replace this assessment exam.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: course exam | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research
  - Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research
- **Implementation Description:** fall 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech Communication faculty

**expand course exam**

The measure was limited to exams covering course material in a single course, Spch 2650. The faculty will consider expanding the number of courses from which exams can be taken to provide a better assessment of the major’s objectives. There should be at least one upper-division course included in this measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: course exam | Outcome/Objective: critical skills
  - Measure: processes, theories, and research
- **Implementation Description:** fall 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech Communication faculty

**paper grading and writing assessment rubric**

Instructors completed their grades and the writing assessment rubric for student papers. There seems to be a discrepancy between grades on these papers and the writing assessment rubric, and this discrepancy is consistent across courses. The speech faculty will discuss their grading and how the rubric, created by the English faculty, may or may not reflect writing within the speech communication discipline.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: critical skills
  - Measure: processes, theories, and research
- **Implementation Description:** fall 07
- **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?**

Speech majors performed very well in oral presentations required in the upper-division course, Spch 3210. The writing rubric was successfully implemented this year. Students scored well in part of the writing measure. Students did very well in the observation assignment of Spch 4400. Students did very well in the collaborative project of Spch 3050.

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

The Speech Communication faculty are undergoing a significant revision of the curriculum. This may involve changing objectives and measures. The consistency of administering the measures remains an issue and the speech faculty have made it a priority to find ways to improve how the data collection regardless of who is conducting the assessment. The exam was revised but its administration must be reviewed. The scores did not increase from the previous year, and the curricular revision will probably mandate another revision of this measure. The competent communicator scale was also implemented this year as part of the grading rubric in Spch 3210, but a comparison of the rubric score to an instructor-assigned grade may also be considered as an additional assessment measure. There is inconsistency among the scores for the writing measure as the grade assigned to the paper did not coincide with the rubric score. This is another example of variations among the faculty which may be addressed in the discussions about curricular revision.
Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Sports Administration degree seeks to prepare graduates with professional skills and knowledge for careers in the $600-plus billion dollar sports business industry through an exceptional program inspired by excellence, vision, scholarship, leadership, and entrepreneurship. This program is one of only 34 approved masters programs in the country (out of 240-plus programs). Within this industry – ranking as the 6th largest industries in the USA – there is a multitude of organizations and enterprises that require highly trained personnel and executives in sport business, such as, sports media (TV, print, electronic), university and high school sports, sports apparel and equipment designers and manufacturers, sports arenas, sport marketing firms, athletic clubs, professional sport teams, fitness management centers, and the sports tourism industry.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)
Student will demonstrate understanding of people who engage in sport.


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
1.6 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
### 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. Quality professional programs
2. Global, cultural perspectives
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
6. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
7. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
8. 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. Quality professional programs
2. Global, cultural perspectives
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
6. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
7. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
8. 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. Quality professional programs
2. Global, cultural perspectives
3. Distinctive education due to urban center of international commerce, media, and government
4. Interdisciplinary research and educational programs
5. Learning-centered environment that support individual learning
6. Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition
7. Partnerships that have a positive impact on community
8. 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
One hundred percent of students scored a passing mark on 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Has work experience in sport business industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Can develop financial planning for sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Describes sport management functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a &quot;satisfactory/unsatisfactory&quot; scale) on the work experience course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students met this performance level with a passing grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings show that the target performance level for this measure was met and exceeded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance for this measure was met and/or exceeded.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance for this measure was met and/or exceeded.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance for this measure was met and/or exceeded.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: Met
Findings show that the target performance for this measure was met and/or exceeded.

---

**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):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Can develop financial planning for sports
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Evaluation of work experience in sport business | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Has work experience in sport business industry
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Major Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Has work experience in sport business industry
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport

**Implementation Description:** September 1, 2007
**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.

**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:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Can develop financial planning for sports
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Evaluation of work experience in sport business | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Has work experience in sport business industry
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Major Projects | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Describes sport management functions
  - Has work experience in sport business industry
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research
  - Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing
  - Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business
  - Understands socio-cultural context of sport
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 2006-07, 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, sociology of sport, and sport management; as well as increase its current level of graduate assistants.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Sports Medicine MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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 Develop. (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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
90% of students demonstrated a 90% competency score on their proficiency examination of 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students demonstrated a 3.5/5 or better on comprehensive examinations prior to graduation at the completion of their graduate course work

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students demonstrated a 3.5/5 or better on comprehensive examinations prior to graduation at the completion of their graduate course work

### M 3: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 2, 4)

Site evaluations are performed twice yearly.

**Target for O2: Understands importance of professional Develop.**

By the completion of two years, 90% of students will have achieved an average score of 4/5 on all evaluative criteria

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved an average score of 4/5 on their evaluative criteria

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved an average score of 4/5 on their evaluative criteria

### 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 Develop.**

90% of students will complete two professional presentation per year

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed a minimum of two presentations per year

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of all students obtain and maintain CPR-AED 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 complete a research project/thesis prior to graduation

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

100% of all students completed a thesis or research project prior to graduation

### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students completed a case study and demonstrated better than 70% proficiency levels

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of students completed a case study and demonstrated better than 70% proficiency levels

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.
- Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- Measure: Final Competency Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
- Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities

Implementation Description: Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator

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 2007-2008 academic year

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Study | Outcome/Objective: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
- Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- Measure: Final Competency Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.
- Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities

Implementation Description: Ongoing for academic year 2007-2008

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. The challenge is increasing as students come into the program with undergraduate deficiencies, and those deficiencies need to be remediated prior to the undertaking of achieving graduate competencies. This issue will merit continued scrutiny and will be addressed in the next section. To achieve this years goals was considerably more challenging than last year, and the major change will be to allow students to work in groups, but revolve the group case study approach in the earlier years of their case studies, but revolve the groups, and eliminate the groups, to strengthen their individual work towards the end of their program and enhance final outcomes.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The graduate students struggled entering graduate school with the deficiencies they present from their undergraduate experience. This required the initiation of a graduate peer tutoring and peer mentoring program to assist in projects, studying, time management, and general adjustment to their classwork, time demands, issues with time management, and adjustment to expectations of clinical mastery. This issue(s) will have to be continually monitored if, as a program, we make the decision to have high graduate expectation, and do not lower the threshold of graduate competency, given the lower undergraduate competency. Additionally, to foster better individual graduate skills, group work is encouraged in the early years for the purpose of idea sharing, but groups are revolved, and group work is eliminated by the beginning of the second year to enhance better individual performance, in areas such as the comprehensive examinations, which relies on individual demonstration of competency. The group projects has allowed certain weaker students to rely on stronger students to do the majority of the work, and prevented overall growth of all students, and mastery of all concepts by all students has been masked by the data.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2006-2007 Sports Science PhD
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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: Develop an understanding of research (M: 1, 3)
That graduates understand the concepts and application of exercise physiology and biomechanics research methodology

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
3.3 Dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Demonstrate good cultural sensitivity skills (M: 6)
Graduates are prepared to work with individuals who are culturally and individually different

Institutional Priority Associations
1.3 Quality professional programs
2.1 Learning-centered environment that support individual learning

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Embrace subspecialties to strengthen skills (M: 5)
Graduates of the program will have a subspecialty that strengthens their skills in their major concentration

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

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

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of our students have taken the statistical core and passed the courses.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students that took comprehensive exams in the last year successfully completed them.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of students that took comprehensive exams presented papers before the exam. In fact we have had students win research awards and some have presented three or four papers.

**Target for O5: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**
That 100% of students complete this requirement.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of students that took comprehensive exams presented papers before the exam. In fact we have had students win research awards and some have presented three or four papers.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All of our students are required to present at a symposium and submit a dissertation grant proposal.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All students have met or are completing this requirement. This requirement will always be met by 100% of students that complete this degree.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Professors within the department include cultural and individual sensitivity in coursework. We feel that our students are well prepared in this area.
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: Refereed 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: Refereed 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 review of student development
The graduate faculty will review 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 |
| Measure: Projects and exams within courses | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate good cultural sensitivity skills |

Implementation Description: Fall, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate faculty

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 |

Implementation Description: Fall, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty

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 |

Implementation Description: Fall, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate faculty

Enhance understanding of research
Have students enroll in research seminars and have research symposiums to help students with this objective.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Implementation Description: Fall, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Sports Science faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on
Analysis was completed by reviewing the components of the program and determining as a faculty how the program meets the needs of our students. We feel that the program is comprehensive, has flexibility and encourages students to proceed with their program under the best possible circumstances. For example, we had one student that visited a lab at another university to develop specialized skill to complete her research.

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

The aspect that requires special attention is that of developing competent research skills. We have a good model in place, but are open to adjustments as needed to ensure that students acquire important practical research skills.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Studio Art BFA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**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
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 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

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal of 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
89% achieved the minimum goal of 3. 59% achieved the target score goal of 4.

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. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal of 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
85% of the students scored the minimum score of 3. 67% of the students scored the target score goal of 4.

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. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
72% of the students scored the minimum score goal of 4. 59% of the students scored the target score goal of 5.

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. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal of 4.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
87% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 3. 69% of the students scored the target score goal of 4.

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. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
84% of the students scored the minimum score goal of 4. 60% of the students scored the target score goal of 5.

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. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
81% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 53% of the students achieved the target score goal of 5.

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. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>87% of the students scored the minimum score goal of 4. 54% of the students scored the target score goal of 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O10: Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1 - 6. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal is 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>66% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 53% of the students achieved the target score goal of 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O11: Contemporary Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1 - 6. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal is 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>78% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 23% of the students achieved the target score goal of 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Analytical Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal of 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>85% of the students scored above the minimum score goal of 3. 56% of the student scored the target goal of 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal of 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>85% of the students scored the minimum goal of 3. 57% of the students scored the target score goal of 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Technical Skill</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1 - 6. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>Scoring from 1-6. Students evaluated were seniors completing the BFA program. Out of 46 students evaluated 82% achieved the minimum score of 4. 70% scored the target score of 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: Senior Level Final Artist Statement (O: 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O12: Historical Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1 - 6. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>84% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 34% of the students achieved the target score goal of 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14: Professional Resume (O: 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional artist resume submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O14: Professional Preparation in the Arts</strong></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?

Progress is seen in the quality in all areas of student work after courses are taken within the major. The most significant areas of achievement are in technical skills, interdisciplinary knowledge, health and safety, collaborative group skills, professional preparation in art, and multi-cultural awareness. Documentation substantiates that the studio work shows greater maturity from sophomore level work to senior level work. On an average, the majority of students (86% at the Foundation level, 80% at the Portfolio II level) exceed

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):
- Measure: BFA Art Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level
- Measure: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
  | Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level | Critical Thinking Skills | Quantitative Skills
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Preparation in the Arts
- Measure: Senior Level Final Artist Statement | Outcome/Objective: Historical Knowledge
- Measure: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues
  | Health and Safety | Interdisciplinary Knowledge | Multi-cultural awareness | Technical Skill
- Measure: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD | Outcome/Objective: Technology

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.

Undergraduate Program Review by Faculty Committee
The School of Art and Design has initiated and Undergraduate Program review based on the results of the Learning Outcomes Assessment results from 2005-06. The committee has restructured the BFA degree. With regard to technical skills the committee and faculty have approved a new course for foundations BFA students entitled Art 3400: Digital Possibilities. The goal of this class will be to introduce student to more technology. It is only open to BFA majors. It will start being offered in Fall 2008 after curriculum approval by College.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: BFA Art Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level
- Measure: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
  | Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level | Critical Thinking Skills | Quantitative Skills
- Measure: Senior Level Final Artist Statement | Outcome/Objective: Historical Knowledge
- Measure: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues
  | Interdisciplinary Knowledge | Multi-cultural awareness | Technical Skill
- Measure: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD | Outcome/Objective: Technology

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergrad Program Review Committee
Additional Resources: This class will involve computer lab time. As needs grow for this lab, the class may generate greater computer needs than this lab can provide. Therefore, additional computers and related technology plus a room may be required as this learning outcome goal is met.

Undergraduate Program Review by Faculty Committee
The School of Art and Design has initiated and Undergraduate Program review based on the results of the Learning Outcomes Assessment results from 2005-06. The committee has restructured the BFA degree and faculty have approved a new course for foundations BFA students entitled Art 1050: Foundations Seminar. The goal of this class will be to provide an overview of each discipline in the School including related health and safety issues, an introduction to basic art theory and criticism, critical writing exercises, an introduction to the gallery/museum/alternative exhibition network of Atlanta, and opportunities for creative collaborative studies. WebCT will figure prominently in the course design. It is open to all students at the Foundation level. It will start being offered in Fall 2008 after curriculum approval by College.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
  | Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level | Critical Thinking Skills | Quantitative Skills

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director Constance Thalken and Undergraduate Program Review Committee

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
86% of the students achieved the minimum score goal of 4. 68% of the students achieved the target score goal of 5.
the minimum goals of the programs.

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

While a vast majority of students are achieving the minimum goals at the Foundation level (86%) and at the Portfolio II level (80%), the target goals in each area require greater attention. At the Foundation level, we will focus on the three lowest scoring objectives (analytical skills, written communication, critical thinking) by implementing the new Art 1050: Foundations Seminar course in the Fall of 2008. At the Portfolio II level, we will address the low scoring objective of technology skills in the new ART 3400: Digital Possibilities course, also to begin in the Fall of 2008. Two additional low scores were in contemporary issues and historical knowledge. Both will be addressed in the newly designed course AH 2000: Contemporary Art Survey, which will be required of all studio art majors.

---
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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, national and global 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)

**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)

**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)

**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)

#### 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 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)

#### 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)

#### 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 6 students evaluated 83% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 50% achieved the target score goal of 5.
### Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met

In evaluating students for collaboration, 0% of the students achieved a score of 1 (poor), 0% achieved a score of 2 (fair), 17% achieved a score of 3 (good), 33% a score of 4 (very good), 17% a score of 5 (excellent), and 33% a score of 6 (outstanding).

### M 2: Portfolio (O: 2)

**Target for O2: Cross Disciplinary knowledge**

Scoring from 1 - 6. Out of the 6 students evaluated 100% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 67% achieved the target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In evaluating cross disciplinary knowledge, 0% of students achieved a score of 1 (poor), 0% a score of 2 (fair), 0% a score of 3 (good), 33% a score of 4 (very good), 67% a score of 5 (excellent), and 0% a score of 6 (outstanding).

### 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 6 students evaluated 83% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 50% achieved the target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In evaluating advanced research skills, 0% of students achieved a score of 1 (poor), 0% a score of 2 (fair), 17% a score of 3 (good), 33% a score of 4 (very good), 33% a score of 5 (excellent), and 17% a score of 6 (outstanding).

### 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 6 students evaluated 83% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 50% achieved the target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In evaluating students on communication, 0% of students achieved a score of 1 (poor), 0% a score of 2 (fair), 17% a score of 3 (good), 33% a score of 4 (very good), 33% a score of 5 (excellent), and 17% a score of 6 (outstanding).

### 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 6 students evaluated 83% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 66% achieved the target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

In evaluating professional skills, 0% of students achieved a score of 1 (poor), 0% a score of 2 (fair), 17% a score of 3 (good), 17% a score of 4 (very good), 33% a score of 5 (excellent), and 33% a score of 6 (outstanding).

### 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 6 students evaluated 83% achieved the minimum score goal of 4 and 66% achieved the target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

When evaluating research and critical thinking via the final portfolio of artwork, 0% of students earned the score of 1 = poor, 0% score of 2 = fair, 17% score of 3 = good, 17% score of 4 = very good, 17% score of 5 = excellent, and 49% score of 6 = outstanding.

### 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):*
Competitive Recruitment Activity

The School will actively recruit stronger graduate students by becoming a member of the National Portfolio Day Association and participating in the nationally competitive portfolio review events beginning Fall 2007. The goal is to attract stronger prospective graduate students to our program who will contribute to higher achievement scores across the board.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Graduate Program Review

The School will undergo a Graduate Program review in 2008-09. New Graduate Director Kathy King will chair a faculty committee that will examine the strengths and weaknesses of the current program. Strategies will be devised to address improvement in all outcomes, particularly 3, 4, and 5.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Publication of Recruitment Materials

The School will design and print promotional materials necessary for effective recruiting of graduate students at the national level. Ads will be published in established fine art magazines to advertise our graduate program to a wider national audience. As higher achieving students enter our program, we anticipate an increase in the student scores across the board.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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?
Graduate students are consistently exceeding the minimum score goal for each of the 6 outcomes. Cross disciplinary knowledge (67%), professional skills (66%), and research and critical thinking (66%) are very near the desired percentage of students (75%) for the target goal.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The lowest scores are in collaboration, communication, and advanced research skills. The Graduate Program Review will consider such strategies as team teaching across disciplines, cross discipline collaborative projects, and cross discipline critique sessions. A research methodology course tailored for the studio arts will be considered.
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>Program Objective (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop ability to conduct research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>Program Objective (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to locate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>Program Objective (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to evaluate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4</th>
<th>Program Objective (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to correctly interpret tax authorities and apply them in unfamiliar settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5</th>
<th>Program Objective (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to communicate effectively in writing and orally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>Performance on exams or other assignments. (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on exams or other assignments in Taxation of Partnerships and Partners (Tx 8080) or Taxation of Corporations and Shareholders (Tx 8120).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Program Objective**
Average score on each exam will be at least 70 percent.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
In Maymester, the average scores on Exam 1, Exam II and the Final Exam were 77, 79, and 87 percent, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>Effective Executive Communication (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Effective Executive Communication (BCom 8250) or communication assignments in an 8000-level course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Based on the initial year’s average performance, the target average score for the class is 80%. This year the class average was 90.15 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>Performance on projects in Tax Research (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on projects in Tax Research Tx8030.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
Average performance score equaled 71 percent.

**M 4: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 2)**

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

Average performance score equaled 49 percent in fall and 44 percent in spring.

**M 5: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 3)**

**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.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

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

**TAX 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: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) | Outcome/Objective: Program Objective
- Implementation Description: Summer 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor

**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: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Performance on exams or other assignments. | Outcome/Objective: Program Objective
- Implementation Description: Summer 2008
- Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor
### 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

#### O/O 6: Increase Student Enrollment in Concentration
Program concentrations will work to increase the number of students enrolling in and successfully completing the program.

**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

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Manages and Monitors Learning/Development - 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

100% of our program completers demonstrated responsibility for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

---

**M 2: Reflects on Professional Experience 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

100% of our program completers demonstrated systematic reflection about their practice and showed that they learned from professional experience.

---

**M 3: Participates in Learning Communities 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

100% of our program completers demonstrated how their personal growth was impacted through membership in one or more learning communities.

---

**M 4: Commitment to Learning and Development 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

100% of candidates “demonstrated commitment to students and their learning and/or development.”

---

**M 5: Apply Expertise - Learning and Development 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 2006-2007** - Target: Met

100% of our candidates demonstrated expertise in their field and documented that they could apply that expertise to promote learning/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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

All program candidates demonstrated scores beyond the intermediate level on all program ratings. With respect to Action Item 1: Core content and Delivery, faculty revised the sequence of the core courses so that the supervision and leadership core course was moved to the spring semester rather than the summer. This allowed greater emphasis on school based supervision projects. The curriculum course was moved to the maymester and taught as a hybrid course blending online and on campus instruction. Feedback from the instructor and students will inform faculty as to the feasibility of this model for the future of this course as well as for other
core courses. The educational inquiry course was revised to include a focus on teacher research and faculty were encouraged to have students wait to take the course toward the end of their program.

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

Action Item 2 focused on ensuring all concentrations created and implemented an assessment system. A standard template of a portfolio system was adopted across concentration areas; however, due to low enrollment in some concentrations the implementation of this assessment system will continue to require attention in future years.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Teaching & Learning PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:04 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: Demonstrates Research Competence (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 2: Demonstrates Social &amp; Psych. Knowledge (M: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 3: Engages in Scholarship in Major Field (M: 3)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 4: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field (M: 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 5: Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate (M: 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
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**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 7: Is Involved in Teaching & Professional Development (M: 7)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
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 8: Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning (M: 8)**
The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating of Research Competence (O: 1)**
A summary rating describing research competence will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Competence**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 14 completers demonstrated evidence of research competence with developing expertise in at least one paradigm (Level 3). Of these, 5 students demonstrated strong competence in designing and conducting research projects and written reports with clear expertise in one or more research paradigms (Level 5).

**M 2: Faculty Rating of Social & Psychological Knowledge (O: 2)**
A summary rating will be determined by the dissertation committee through review of the student´s residency report and related artifacts, comprehensive exam answers, and dissertation performance to determine the student’s knowledge of social and psychological underpinnings of their discipline.

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Social & Psych. Knowledge**
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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 14 completers demonstrated a good understanding of the different forces that shape and influence education today (Level 3). Of these, 8 students demonstrated an in-depth and critical awareness and understanding of the different forces that shape and influence education today.

**M 3: Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major (O: 3)**
The student’s dissertation committee will derive a summary rating to describe the student’s scholarship in his/her major by examining
the residency report for presentations, publications, and research reports, by reviewing quality of work within research internships, and by analyzing the quality of the dissertation.

**Target for O3: Engages in Scholarship 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 (Level 5).

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of our 14 completers demonstrated engagement in scholarship in his/her major discipline of inquiry (Level 3). Seven of the completers demonstrated scholarship rated as "sparking new understandings and setting new directions for his/her major field of inquiry (Level 5)."

**M 4: Faculty Rating of Knowledge Within Major Field (O: 4)**
A summary rating describing knowledge within major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, on the performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on theory and research in the major field, and on the dissertation performance.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the 14 program completers achieved an extended knowledge base of the major field of inquiry (Level 3). Of these, 10 demonstrated an extended knowledge base that showed depth, breadth and critical understandings (Level 5).

**M 5: Faculty Rating of Knowledge in Cognate (O: 5)**
A summary rating describing knowledge within the cognate will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, on the performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on theory and research in the cognate area, and on the dissertation performance.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated a good extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry (Level 3). Of these, nine showed depth, breadth and critical understandings in their cognate area (Level 5).

**M 6: Faculty Rating of Contributions to the Profession (O: 6)**
A summary rating will be determined by the dissertation committee through review of the student’s residency report, related artifacts, and his/her vita to determine the student’s contribution to the profession.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the program completers demonstrated a professional identity by often contributing to the community of scholars and educators (Level 3). Of these, seven demonstrated a very strong professional identity by very consistent contributions to the community of scholars and educators (Level 5).

**M 7: Faculty Rating - Professional Leadership (O: 7)**
A summary rating will be determined by the dissertation committee through review of the student’s residency report, related artifacts, presentation/teaching plans or syllabi, vita, and/or teaching evaluations to determine the student’s teaching and professional involvement.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the program completers demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional development in the major field of inquiry (Level 3). Of these, ten demonstrated very strong leadership through very consistent teaching and professional development in the major field of inquiry (Level 5).

**M 8: Faculty Rating of Uses of Technology (O: 8)**
A summary rating will be determined by the dissertation committee through review of the student’s residency report and related technology artifacts demonstrating technology uses for teaching, learning, and/or research.

**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
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
- **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:** Medium
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007 school year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D Faculty in Teaching and Learning concentrations

Increase Communication Across Concentrations
Although a common core exists for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning, the 6 concentrations for this degree rarely come together to discuss the program. To increase faculty awareness of opportunities and experiences of our students across programs, annual meetings will be held with faculty across concentrations. This cooperation may lead to greater coordination of the nature of experiences related to each standard and improved artifacts demonstrating competency related to these standards. In addition, a template for an electronic portfolio for residency experiences will be developed and made available for student use.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating - Professional Leadership | **Outcome/Objective:** Is Involved in Teaching & Professional Development
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Contributions to the Profession | **Outcome/Objective:** Contributes to the Profession
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Knowledge in Cognate | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Knowledge Within Major Field | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Research Competence | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Research Competence
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in Scholarship in Major Field
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Social & Psychological Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Social & Psych. Knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Uses of Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning

- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Division Chairs and Program Faculty

Standardize Content of Core Department Seminar
A move to a new departmental organization has resulted in the core department seminar (EDCI 8970) being taught by new faculty members across different divisions. In order to develop consistency across sections, meetings of the faculty to be involved in the courses will be held at a minimum of once a year to discuss course content. This will impact the flow of information to all students regarding degree requirements and therefore has the potential to impact all objectives/outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Contributions to the Profession | **Outcome/Objective:** Contributes to the Profession
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Knowledge in Cognate | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Knowledge Within Major Field | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Research Competence | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Research Competence
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in Scholarship in Major Field
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Social & Psychological Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Social & Psych. Knowledge
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Uses of Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses Technology in Teaching and Learning

- **Implementation Description:** 2006-2007

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated a good understanding of technology and used technology often as a tool for inquiry for teaching and learning (Level 3). Of these, five had a very strong understanding and used technology on a very consistent basis as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning (Level 5).
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

All students met expectations on each learning outcome. Specific steps which were taken by the concentrations this year to increase scholarly productivity included implementation of writing support seminars, student-led support groups, and increased student/teacher collaboration on research projects (Action Item 1). High ratings were evident in the area of teacher education/professional development involvement (Action Plan 2). Students serving as teaching interns were monitored in their teaching evaluations and this supported faculty ratings of teaching effectiveness. In addition, the graduate seminar for teaching interns provided additional support for candidates working in teacher education while pursuing their Ph.D. Improvements were evident in implementing data collection across concentrations with complete data being submitted for 14 graduates across the concentrations of Language and Literacy Education (4), Mathematics Education (5), Music Education (1), Science Education (3), and Social Studies Education (1).

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

Although all target areas were met and progress was made with respect to each action item, efforts will continue to be made to strengthen collaboration and communication across the concentrations in order to best support the experiences of all candidates within the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning.

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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Structure of Local Governments 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
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 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.

### 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 interdisiplinary 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.

**Findings 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
During the previous academic year, 55.56% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 26.39% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate the skill.

#### M 2: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities (O: 1, 6)
Student will be able to describe important policy issues facing cities.

**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 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
During the previous academic year, 33.33% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 38.46% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007** - Target: **Not Met**
During the previous academic year, 33.33% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 38.46% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate the skill.
During the previous academic year, 33.33% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 38.46% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 53.47% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 28.47% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 59.26% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 35.19% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 59.26% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 35.19% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 38.89% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 53.70% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 50.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 43.86% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 50.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 43.86% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 59.26% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 35.19% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 59.26% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 35.19% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 80.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 16.00% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 72.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 24.00% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 76.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 20.00% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 60.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 32.00% of students partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate the skill.

**M 12: Understand Urban Policy Research Methods (O: 3)**

Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to urban policy.
### 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 82.5% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 17.5% partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 70.00% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 25.00% partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

During the previous academic year, 62.5% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 35.00% partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 56.06% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 22.73% partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met**

During the previous academic year, 45.45% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 25.76% partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Not Met
During the previous academic year, 46.97% of students fully demonstrated the skill. Another 25.76% at partially demonstrated the skill. The remainder did not demonstrate 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: Define and Identify Market Failures | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Policy Studies
- 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 Research Methods
- Measure: Urban Policy Writing Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies
- Measure: Write a Research Proposal | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy

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, statistics, and research design).

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: Define and Identify Market Failures | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy | Outcome/Objective: Public Policy Process
- Measure: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
- Measure: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities | Outcome/Objective: Structure of Local Governments in the U.S.
- Measure: Urban Policy Studies
- 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 Research Methods
- Measure: Urban Policy Writing Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies
- Measure: Write a Research Proposal | Outcome/Objective: Urban Political Economy
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 the following months.

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: 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: 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: 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 Policy Writing Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies

Implementation Description: March 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: All PAUS Faculty

Action Plan for the BSUPS Degree

We have asked for this degree to be discontinued. As you might imagine, this could get to be a fairly long story, but there is a short answer that is very much related to the WEAVE process. Overall, our decision to eliminate this degree had to do with student engagement. The numbers collected here were not impressive, and they seem to be going down. We are not going to fret too much about a one-year trend, but we want a program that sets a standard for student achievement that others envy. The historical draw of the BSUPS degree was the fact that it offered interesting specialization. We have some students interested in cities, and we have some faculty very interested in teaching about cities, but, on the whole, the concept of the degree only fit the objectives of the most dedicated urbanists. We are taking the specializations from the BSUPS and moving them to our BSPuP degree--the BS with a major in public policy and also adding some new specializations. We think we have an exciting degree.

http://aysps.gsu.edu/academics/undergraduaterequirements/BSPUP.htm There are a number of top policy programs with these types of degrees, and our degree compares nicely with them. This degree makes more realistic assumptions about the career plans of students, and the content addresses issues that are exciting and important--like citizenship, policy analysis, evaluation, and leadership. The original BSUPS was certainly a skill-oriented degree, but our focus is now on professional skills, rather than what were more along the lines of academic skills. We swapped a statistics class for an evaluation class, for example. Statistics, even in an applied class, is still mostly about formulas. Evaluation can be taught with statistical applications, but it is fundamentally different—the focus is on public programs and nonprofit organizations. Students are going to be much more interested. Students are also going to know that they are studying public policy in a top-ranked policy school and they are getting a nationally competitive degree. We are not offering an undergraduate professional degree, but students will know that they are being introduced to the work done in an important profession. This is a degree that will stress writing and critical thinking. It is very much in line with current thinking about the needs of students and employers. We also believe that this is a degree that is going to command more attention from our faculty. The BSUPS scared some who did not think of themselves as urban. We will have an urban specialization in the new degree, of course, but also others like public management and governance. Classes in budgeting and public administration are prominently placed in the degree.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Spring 08
Additional Resources: We made a number of changes...some cost us a bit more and some produce savings. The only real new cost here is the new NonProfit concentration, but this is an area where our college has been investing.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

We have strong instructors. The course evaluations in our department tend to be very good...we put committed teachers into the classroom. In this process, we combine these motivated individuals with high student performance standards in the form of our learning objectives. As a result, some of the ratings are low, and this is most likely because the instructors did not cut the students much slack when doing the ratings. These are undergraduates, after all, and they do not all have 4.0 averages. Where we have gone wrong is that the instructors do not yet fully accept responsibility for learning. They see their job as providing good instruction. The high evaluations suggest that the students are also buying into the same set of assumptions. They are too willing to accept not learning. We are working on getting instructors to take more responsibility for learning. We now have three instructors who have been through the writing across the curriculum training, and we have begun an initiative to assess and restructure the writing...
assignments that students do in all of our programs. WEAVE has been a catalyst for change, and we are making progress, one instructor at a time.

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

These data show that we have problems that need to be addressed. We are most concerned about the recurrent problems in the 4031 statistics class. This class is at the core of what we do, and changes are needed. We held extensive meetings on BSUPS related topics in the spring of the year, and these meetings lead to the changes that are discussed in our action plan. Our new undergraduate committee played a key role. (This is a side benefit of the WEAVE process, that we have created a number of academic committees to better connect faculty to our academic degrees.) One of the changes that resulted from work on the BSUPS degree was converting 4031 an evaluation class, rather than being a statistics class. This will provide a better context for examples and enhance student engagement. Our students have math issues, as we noted before, but it is also clear that students were not willing to put in the effort needed to master a challenging topic. The poor performance in 3011 was also noted. One issue with this class is that a sizable proportion of the students are majors from other departments. It is not hard to understand why students would have trouble with statistics, but 3011 is harder to understand. A likely possibility is once again engagement. We have working students in PAUS, as do many other departments at GSU...and, whether students work or not, they have plenty of other ways to spend their time. Without a professional commitment, with expectations and possible benefits, it is hard to see substantial progress. One of the 3011 instructors is a seasoned Writing Across the Curriculum instructor, and he has been very creative at using writing to get students thinking about the topics presented in the class. Our frustration with this situation lead to the more radical actions described in our action plan.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2006-2007 Urban Policy Studies MS**
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( 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, 18, 19, 20, 21)**

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)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Literature for Urban Policy Research</th>
<th>Examine major sources of literature for urban policy research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, all students at least partially demonstrated the skill. 72% fully demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: History of Urban Planning (O: 2)</th>
<th>Become acquainted with the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 72% fully demonstrated the skill. 27% partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% did not demonstrate the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices (O: 2)</th>
<th>Become familiar with important issues and techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 82% fully demonstrated the skill, 9% partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% did not demonstrate the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Models of Planning Processes (O: 2)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 72% fully demonstrated the skill, 18% partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% did not demonstrate the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Statistics - Basic Concepts (O: 2)</th>
<th>Become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 51% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Introductory Statistical Techniques (O: 2)</th>
<th>Learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Urban Policy Studies Core</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>During the previous academic year, 75% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 23% of students partially demonstrated the skill, and 3% of students did not demonstrate the skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M 7: Basic Statistical Analysis (O: 2)
Develop skills in 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
During the previous academic year, 75% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 16% of students partially demonstrated the skill, and 10% of students did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 70% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 21% of students partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% of students did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 52% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 44% partially demonstrated the skill, and 4% did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 34% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 58% partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 66% of students fully demonstrated the skill, 25% partially demonstrated the skill, and 9% did not demonstrate 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Over the previous academic year, 87% 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 87% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### M 14: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 87% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### M 15: Know Principal Actors in Local Governance (O: 2)
Know the principal 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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**
Over the previous academic year, 87% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### M 16: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the previous academic year, 91% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

### M 17: 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
During the previous academic year, all students fully demonstrated the skill.

### M 18: Political processes and institutions (O: 2)
Students will be able to examine the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level.

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Over the previous academic year, all students fully demonstrated the skill.

M 19: Identify market failures (O: 2)
Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Over the previous academic year, 83% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 20: Issues and solutions for collective action (O: 2)
Students will learn to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met
Over the previous academic year, 87% of students fully demonstrated the skill. All students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

M 21: Urban growth (O: 2)
Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

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 2006-2007 - Target: Met
Over the previous academic year, all students fully 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: 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: 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
- Measure: Models of Planning Processes | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies Core
- Measure: Statistics - Basic Concepts | Outcome/Objective: Urban Policy Studies Core

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Second faculty meeting to discuss outcomes
We will again convene the faculty responsible for teaching in the MS/UPS program. Faculty members will be responsible for considering ways of improving outcomes specific to their courses. The faculty will be expected to meet informally, with formal meetings to approve and implement changes needed for program improvement.

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

Continue faculty discussion of MS-UPS program
The faculty will continue to discuss methods to improve the quality of the MS-UPS program. We will continue these discussions in the context of the findings and analysis presented in this 2006-07 weave report. From these meetings, the faculty will develop recommendations to achieve three tasks: improve student proficiency related to program objectives, particularly in understanding literature on urban policy research, statistical concepts and microeconomics; increase student access to courses; and heighten student retention in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
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?
Consistent with the WEAVE process, a specially-appointed committee of faculty met twice per month throughout the late fall and spring terms to review the MS/UPS degree program. All aspects of the degree in Urban Policy Studies were carefully reviewed, and recommendations are being developed to modify the degree program. The faculty of the Department and the AYSPS have approved this process, and we are moving forward to address a number of concerns related to the degree program. One of the important issues identified during the discussions is the fact that the focus of the degree may not be consistent with the learning needs of the students as well as the teaching interests of the faculty. This is evident by the declining enrollment in the MS/UPS during recent years. A possibility under consideration is to broaden the degree program to become a Master of Public Policy (MPuP), rather than to continue the emphasis on urban policy. While the basic outline for a new MPuP degree has been agreed upon by the faculty, much work remains to be done in securing approval for the new program by the University and the Board of Regents. The members of the Department feel that the policy-focused degree is consistent with the mission of the School and has already succeeded in attracting more support from faculty who are interested in policy issues. One important feature of the new MPuP will be a specialization in Urban Policy that will continue the emphasis on urban policy issues that was the focus of the MS/UPS degree. This should satisfy the needs of faculty and the interests of students to learn about urban policy issues while also continuing a well-regarded program of study in this important area. Thus, the process of reviewing the MS/UPS degree during the past year as part of the WEAVE process has helped the faculty to focus on the future and the development of the new MPuP degree. It is an indication of strength that faculty members of the MS/UPS curriculum committee, the Department, and the School have endorsed the process that is underway.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The areas identified by the faculty that will require continued attention are improving student proficiency related to program objectives, particularly in understanding literature on urban policy research, statistical concepts and microeconomics; increasing student access to courses; and increasing student retention in the program. These areas, as well as the degree program as a whole, will continue to be discussed by the faculty and acted upon in the next year.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
MSUPS faculty have been active in evaluating progress and working to achieve goals. MSUPS faculty have contributed substantially to university-wide initiatives and engaged in public service projects with a number of organizations. MSUPS faculty have continued assessment of learning outcomes and means for increasing student enrollment. MSUPS faculty have been engaged in a wide range of research projects, resulting in a number of articles and books published during 2006.

Contributions to the Institution
The MSUPS program continues to support Georgia State University’s role as a leader in public service education. Faculty serve on a number of key university committees, including the Faculty Advisory Board for the Georgia State Career Services Program, Charitable Contributions Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee for the Career Development Center, Study Abroad Study Faculty Review Committee, Faculty Senate, and Hearing Panel.

Highlights
The Department has supported the graduate student-run organization, the PAUS Network, and a revitalization of the PAUS Alumni Club. Both of these organizations sponsored events during 2006. In the fall of 2006, the Department published the second issue of the PAUS Informer, which promoted department and college events and provided new students with additional information about our academic programs. The Department continued a series of regular lunch hour seminars. Three were offered during spring and fall 2006; one focused on leadership strategies, one was a career fair, and one was on education policy. PAUS added two new study abroad opportunities to the existing program in 2006.

Challenges
The MSUPS program is challenged by a difficult market for students. Wide availability of professional positions in the Atlanta area has led many students to work full-time instead of pursuing graduate studies, which has resulted in challenges for keeping enrollments robust. We are working as a faculty to identify opportunities for growth and ways to innovatively meet our enrollment challenges.

Teaching Activities
Faculty continued conversation about the MSUPS curriculum and is in the process of determining which courses should be included in the core and which should be included as electives.

Research and Scholarly Activities
During 2006, 281 scholarly papers, chapters and books were published or forthcoming by faculty in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Another 177 papers are presently under review and in the revision process. It is also heartening to note that 35% of the published or accepted papers in 2006 were joint products of two or more of our faculty or research associates. This research appears in some of the most highly respected journals in public administration, public policy, and economics. A complete list of articles and books published by MSUPS faculty during 2006 can be accessed at http://aysps.gsu.edu/ar2006/faculty/papers.htm.

Public/Community Service
MSUPS faculty are involved in technical training, technical assistance, and applied research projects for a number of government and non-profit organizations. Client organizations include agencies at the local, state, and federal levels. MSUPS faculty are involved in community service through the applied research centers in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, including the Non-Profit Studies Program, the Public Performance and Management Group, the Fiscal Research Center, and the Georgia Health Policy Center. A full list of projects can be accessed at http://aysps.gsu.edu/ar2006/externalfunding/index.htm.

International Activities
The PAUS department created a study-abroad student exchange program for students at The University of Northumbria’s (UNN) School of Arts and Social Sciences, located in Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K. In addition to the PAUS department's collaboration with the University of Northumbria (UNN), a second study abroad exchange program available to graduate students was created through a joint effort with the Institut de Hautes Études en Administration Publique (IDHEAP) at the University of Lausanne. The PAUS department has partnered with Schiller International University to provide both undergraduate and graduate students with an opportunity to study the policies, the procedures, and the general nature of the European Union. The program titled, “The European Union: International Relationships, Cultural Diversity, and Environmental Policy” is an intensive 21-day study abroad program and based in the cities of Strasbourg and Paris, France. Thanks to ties with Schiller International University, the Andrew Young School was able to host a guest lecture by Harald Leibrecht, a distinguished member of the German Bundestag active in both the EU and UN. Mr. Leibrecht’s lecture generated a great deal of interest among the University community and was well attended.
**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.

**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

**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 has one of its core propositions that teachers critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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 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 theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education. The Standards for Advanced...
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)

Students will understand major behavioral, cognitive, and sociohistorical approaches to learning. Students will recognize the talents of urban children in order to foster academic achievement of these children. Students will reflect effectively on their classroom practices in order to stay on the cutting edge of what is best for children, schools and communities. Students will tap into community resources to enhance the learning process and environments of urban children.

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 practices. 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 (0-50pts)(45-50pts)- prepared/ready assignments, knows material, demonstrates authentic interest in subject matter, participates frequently; 39-44pts - prepared/ready 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 occasionally, (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 2006-2007 - 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 2006-2007 - 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). EPSF 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 7120/EPSF 7410/EPSF 7450 - 80 - 90 percent of students score above above 80 pts.

Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met
More than 85 percent of the students are at or above the targeted performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Research project rubric (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.)(0-20pts) - research journals; (0-20pts) - action research report; (0-20pts) - 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”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
More than 85 percent of the students are at or above the targeted performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Course activities- presentations, quizzes, papers (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Students understand approaches to learning**
Students will score at or above 80 points in both courses.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored at least 80 points in both courses

**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-papers, 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

**Maintain and monitor program strengths**
Faculty will continue to implement the programs as designed, while monitoring all current student learning outcomes in the 2007-08 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2006-2007
- **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-papers, 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**: Fall 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?**
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 schools.

**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.
### 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: Written communication–core (M: 2)

Students will effectively use appropriate writing conventions and formats. Students will read critically and carefully, as well as interpret and challenge interdisciplinary work. Students will connect what they learn with lived experiences.

**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

#### SLO 2: Write an effective argument (M: 1, 3)

Write an argument effectively showing the ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence for claims, and formulate new research questions.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

#### SLO 3: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (M: 1, 3)

Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to use appropriate theoretical perspectives

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

#### SLO 4: Apply skills to particular project (M: 1)

Apply interdisciplinary women’s studies knowledge and skills to a particular project

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.1 Graduate and research programs with national and global recognition

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Major papers (O: 2, 3, 4)**
We evaluated papers written by upper-level women's studies students in 4000 level courses, WST 4810, 4830, and 4910. We also evaluated the two papers from seniors, one who completed senior research, and the other from the internship course.

**Target for O2: Write an effective argument**

All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

We evaluated the sample of papers on the same 5 point scale (where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor) on four rubrics. On the first, thesis statement, 80% received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.9. On the second, evidence, development and organization, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with a mean of 2.7. On the third, writing style, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.4. On the fourth, demonstration of feminist/womanist knowledge, all students received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.2.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives**

All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

We evaluated the sample of papers on the same 5 point scale (where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor) on four rubrics. On the first, thesis statement, 80% received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.9. On the second, evidence, development and organization, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with a mean of 2.7. On the third, writing style, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.4. On the fourth, demonstration of feminist/womanist knowledge, all students received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.2.

**Target for O4: Apply skills to particular project**

All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

We evaluated the sample of papers on the same 5 point scale (where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor) on four rubrics. On the first, thesis statement, 80% received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.9. On the second, evidence, development and organization, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with a mean of 2.7. On the third, writing style, 80% received at least a 3, 80% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.4. On the fourth, demonstration of feminist/womanist knowledge, all students received at least a 3, 60% received a 1 or 2, with an average of 2.2.

**M 2: WST 2010 Research Paper (O: 1)**

Students will complete a 10pp research paper involving a literature review, interview and observation data, critical analysis, and personal reflection, using an established writing style (APA, MLA, or Chicago).

**Target for O1: Written communication--core**

100% of 2010 students will earn at least a C on the research paper, with at least 20% earning an A and at least 50% earning a B- or higher.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

50% of students received an A- or A on the paper. 35% of students received a B-, B, or B+. 10% of students received a C-, C, or C+ on the paper. 5% of students received a D+ on the paper. 3 students did not turn the paper in, so their data could not be evaluated and was not included in the percentages.

**M 3: Examinations (O: 2, 3)**

Examinations, based on short-answer essay questions, from two upper level courses: WST 4790 and WST 4810

**Target for O2: Write an effective argument**

All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

We evaluated our sample of exams on a 5 point (where 1 is highest and 5 is lowest) scale with 3 rubrics. On rubric one, demonstrates theoretical knowledge, all students received a 3 or higher, with an average of 2.3. 2/3 of the students received a 1 or 2, close to our goal of 70%. On rubric two, develops well-argued response, all students achieved at least a 3, also with an average of 2.3 and with 2/3 of the students receiving a 1 or 2. On rubric three, expresses ideas clearly, all students also received at least a 3, in fact all students or 100% received a one or two, with an average of 1.67.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives**

All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Partially Met**

We evaluated our sample of exams on a 5 point (where 1 is highest and 5 is lowest) scale with 3 rubrics. On rubric one, demonstrates theoretical knowledge, all students received a 3 or higher, with an average of 2.3. 2/3 of the students received a 1 or 2, close to our goal of 70%. On rubric two, develops well-argued response, all students achieved at least a 3, also with an average of 2.3 and with 2/3 of the students receiving a 1 or 2. On rubric three, expresses ideas clearly, all students also received at least a 3, in fact all students or 100% received a one or two, with an average of 1.67.
Assignment Re-selection
Select more appropriate assignments to evaluate
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: ongoing
- Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
- Additional Resources: time

Class assignment re-alignment
Explore possibilities of changing class assignments to align more directly with learning outcomes
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Implementation Description: Ongoing
- Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
- Additional Resources: Time

Improve rubrics
Consider implementing more explicit criteria to define rubrics for student assignments
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: ongoing
- Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
- Additional Resources: Time

Modify assessment
Departmental Conversation about evaluators’ interpretations of measures and/or the measures themselves
- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Ongoing
- Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
- Additional Resources: Time

100% Participation
Given that some students did not turn in a paper at all, 100% participation in all coursework by all students will be sought, in order to facilitate the development of writing in students who may be afraid of writing or lackadaisical about assignments.
- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: WST 2010 Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Written communication--core
  - Implementation Description: Fall 2007
  - Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Develop rubric that emphasizes skills application
We should increase our focus, in the assessment, on how students are applying their theoretical perspectives to a specific project, to align a rubric with learning outcome 3 more carefully. While one of our rubrics does address it somewhat, we can clarify the connection to strengthen our assessment.
- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Apply skills to particular project
  - Implementation Description: Fall 2007
  - Responsible Person/Group: Director of undergraduate studies

Early intervention
We are designating our 3010 course, Feminist Theories, as a Critical Thinking Through Writing Course, which should focus attention on student writing earlier in the program.
- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives
  - Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Write an effective argument
  - Implementation Description: Fall 2007
  - Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty (Many of us teach WSt 3010)
Implement writing instruction in classes
In our upper level courses, we should spend more time discussing the specific mechanics of paper writing, emphasizing thesis statements, organization, and development.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Write an effective argument

Implementation Description: Fall 2007-Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Core Faculty

Raise the bar
Given that so many students are already getting A’s, the standards for an A paper will be raised to challenge students who would already get A’s to a higher standard of learning and performance.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: WST 2010 Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Written communication--core

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

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 is that we completely switched the sample from last year. Last year, we evaluated our learning outcomes only for WSt 2010, the introductory course, whereas this year, we examined the outcomes for both 2010 and the major. Therefore, last year’s results were only partially useful. Given that, though, it was somewhat surprising to note that we did, in fact, fulfill many of our action plans from last year. In particular, we were able to more explicitly develop rubrics that evaluated our students progress more accurately. We developed a number of rubrics for many of the learning outcomes that improved our reporting of student performance. Additionally, we selected more assignments to evaluate, by including examinations as well as major papers. Furthermore, we certainly engaged in departmental conversations about our interpretations of how to measure student performance, which is responsible for our progress in the above areas. The results for this year have been quite heartening. While we have not always met our target goals, we have come close, so that 66.7% of students have received a 1 or 2 on many assignments where our goal is 70%. In particular, it seems that students are doing quite well on their exams, although there is still room for improvement, especially in terms of students conveying their understandings of theoretical perspectives on womanism/feminism. There is also room for improvement in the area of bringing underperforming students into the fold, so to speak, that is, getting all students to turn in all assignments. This will be a target for next year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We have found that students tend to be writing more clearly in an examination format than in a paper format. While our findings still came close to meeting our target levels, we should work to improve our writing instruction, both specifically in the CTW class as well as in all our upper-level courses. In particular, we should emphasize clear thesis statements, development, and organization, as these seemed the skills that students needed the most work on. Additionally, while our assessment process did go more smoothly this year, we should still develop a rubric that more specifically addresses the learning outcome that focuses on students’ ability to apply theoretical knowledge to a particular project. In addition, we should shoot for 100% participation on all assignments, and, for those students who are ready, raise the bar on standards.
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**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students taking 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 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students taking the exam passed the exam.

**Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements**
All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students taking the exam passed the exam.

**Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology**
All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students taking the exam passed the exam.

**Target for O5: Original Research Project in Women`s Studies**
All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students taking 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.

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Theory**
All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students who completed a thesis paper passed their thesis at their defense.

**Target for O2: Globalization and Women**
All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students who completed a thesis paper passed their thesis at their defense.

**Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements**
All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**
All 4 students who completed a thesis paper passed their thesis at their defense.

**Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology**
All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All 4 students who completed a thesis paper passed their thesis at their defense.

**Target for OS: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies**

All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

**Findings 2006-2007 - Target: Met**

All 4 students who completed a thesis paper 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):**

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
  - Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology
  - Feminist/Womanist Theory
  - Globalization and Women
  - Original Research Project in Women’s Studies

- **Measure:** Master’s Thesis
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
  - Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology
  - Feminist/Womanist Theory
  - Globalization and Women
  - Original Research Project in Women’s Studies

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2006 and forward

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Layli Phillips)

**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):**

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
  - Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology
  - Feminist/Womanist Theory
  - Globalization and Women
  - Original Research Project in Women’s Studies

**Implementation Description:** 2006-07 Academic Year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Layli Phillips)

**Continue moving students through the program.**

Getting students who have been here longer than 2.5 years to finish up and making sure newer students maintain satisfactory progress with regard to the comprehensive exam and thesis is the desired action.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
  - Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology
  - Feminist/Womanist Theory
  - Globalization and Women
  - Original Research Project in Women’s Studies

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Layli Phillips)

**Additional Resources:** More lucrative graduate assistantships would be an aid to timely student completion of the comprehensive exams and thesis.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Last year, we decided to change our comprehensive exam procedure from a two-paper format to a sitting exam format, in order to more effectively assess core knowledge in women’s studies. This year, because students who took the comprehensive exam fell in different cohorts, our data is comprised of both kinds of exams. Nevertheless, based on this limited data, it seems that the new procedure is a more effective measure of core knowledge in women’s studies. As for the thesis itself, students continued to do well and no change is needed, other than the graduation of more students. Given the fluctuations in student cohort size, this figure will vary from year to year.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

As stated above, the adjustments we made since last year appear to be beneficial, however, more accumulation of data is needed.