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
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 69%. In 7 of the 12 sub-outcomes/objectives the students are not meeting the target level of 65%.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 69%. In 7 of the 12 sub-outcomes/objectives the students are not meeting the target level of 65%.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 56%. 6 of the 10 sub-outcomes/objectives do not meet the target.
### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 56%. 6 of the 10 sub-outcomes/objectives do not meet the target.

### M3: Acct 2102: Document accounting usefulness (O: 1, 2)

Acct 2102: Document the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions.

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 66%. 4 of the 10 sub-outcomes/objectives do not meet the target.

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions pertaining to this objective was 66%. 4 of the 10 sub-outcomes/objectives do not meet the target.

### M4: Acct 2101: Interpret financial transaction effects (O: 1, 2)

Acct 2101: Interpret the financial impact of transactions, including revenue recognition and capitalization; complete steps in the accounting cycle.

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score on quizzes and exams which tested this learning objective was 85%

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills

A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score on quizzes and exams which tested this learning objective was 85%

### M5: Acct 2101: Perform basic accounting calculations (O: 1)

Acct 2101: Perform basic calculations for allowance accounts, inventory costing, and depreciation of fixed assets.

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score on quizzes and exams which tested this learning objective was 77%

### M6: Acct 2101: Prepare financial statements (O: 1)


**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on quizzes and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score on quizzes and exams which tested this learning objective was 80%

### M7: Acct 4210: Develop performance measures (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4210: Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation, and control of organizations’ business processes.

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The mean score on essays and problems in exams which tested this learning objective was 85%

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The mean score on essays and problems in exams which tested this learning objective was 85%

### 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

### Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exams which tested this learning objective was 74%

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exams which tested this learning objective was 74%

### 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

### Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exams which tested this learning objective was 68%

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
A mean score of at least 80% on quizzes and exams.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exams which tested this learning objective was 68%

### 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

### Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case). Better than prior year’s performance for set 2 (BloomScape case).

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For set 1, least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 12.7% (p < 0.01) (fall 2007) and 17.5% (p < 0.001) higher (spring 2008) than the norm established in fall 2005. The adjusted means were 2.3% (fall 2007) and 6.3% (spring 2008) better than fall 2006. For set 2, an integrative exam encompassing all the learning outcomes (querying databases, designing business processes, designing databases, and evaluating internal control), least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were statistically similar to fall 2006 means.

### Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills
Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case). Better than prior year’s performance for set 2 (BloomScape case).

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For set 1, least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 12.7% (p < 0.01) (fall 2007) and 17.5% (p < 0.001) higher (spring 2008) than the norm established in fall 2005. The adjusted means were 2.3% (fall 2007) and 6.3% (spring 2008) better than fall 2006. For set 2, an integrative exam encompassing all the learning outcomes (querying databases, designing business processes, designing databases, and evaluating internal control), least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were statistically similar to fall 2006 means.
### 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

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

Equivalent to or better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With dual use of text and audio versions of case conversations, least-squares means, adjusted for GPA, regained their 2005 levels in fall 2007. Spring 2008 means were 9.9% (p = .07) larger than fall 2007 means.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

Equivalent to or better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With dual use of text and audio versions of case conversations, least-squares means, adjusted for GPA, regained their 2005 levels in fall 2007. Spring 2008 means were 9.9% (p = .07) larger than fall 2007 means.

### M 12: Acct 4310: Design and implement databases (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4310: Design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

Better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the integrative exam including the learning outcome of designing and implementing databases, the learning gains experienced in fall 2006 were sustained in fall 2007 and spring 2008. (Least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 17% (p = 0.001) higher in fall 2006 than in fall 2005. The increase in performance was attributed to (1) more focused work on developing querying skills in the first four weeks of the course, (2) more practice before exams in answering questions keyed to learning outcomes germane to the exams, and (3) better pacing and guidance for the integrative case leading up to the exam.)

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

Better than prior year’s performance

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the integrative exam including the learning outcome of designing and implementing databases, the learning gains experienced in fall 2006 were sustained in fall 2007 and spring 2008. (Least-squares means adjusted for students’ GPAs were 17% (p = 0.001) higher in fall 2006 than in fall 2005. The increase in performance was attributed to (1) more focused work on developing querying skills in the first four weeks of the course, (2) more practice before exams in answering questions keyed to learning outcomes germane to the exams, and (3) better pacing and guidance for the integrative case leading up to the exam.)

### M 13: Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks associated with information systems.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

2007 norm for the 24-Seven Part 2 case

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

A new case was developed for fall 2007 to assess the learning outcome of evaluating internal control by adding conversations about accounts payable processing to the 24-Seven business process case. This approach resulted in a richer case than if the case offered a completely new business situation. Adjusted for GPA, least-squares means were 9% (p = .025) higher in spring 2008 than in fall 2007. Students reported that they wished they had had more time to work on the case, commensurate with their perception of its complexity and the value of learning to evaluate internal control in a realistic business situation.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

2007 norm for the 24-Seven Part 2 case

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

A new case was developed for fall 2007 to assess the learning outcome of evaluating internal control by adding conversations about accounts payable processing to the 24-Seven business process case. This approach resulted in a richer case than if the case offered a completely new business situation. Adjusted for GPA, least-squares means were 9% (p = .025) higher in spring 2008 than in fall 2007. Students reported that they wished they had had more time to work on the case, commensurate with their perception of its complexity and the value of learning to evaluate internal control in a realistic business situation.

### M 14: Acct 4510: Identify tax issues (O: 1, 2)

Acct 4510: Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 73%. 2 of the 15 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 73%. 2 of the 15 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: Acct 4510: Select and apply tax laws (O: 1, 2)**
Acct 4510: Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 75%. 2 of the 25 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 75%. 2 of the 25 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on exam scores measuring this objective, the average score was 73%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on exam scores measuring this objective, the average score was 73%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on exam scores measuring this objective, the average score was 73%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on exam scores measuring this objective, the average score was 73%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

Due to lack of class time, material pertaining to this learning objective was not taught in class and students were not assessed on this outcome.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

A score of at least 75% on case assignments.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

Due to lack of class time, material pertaining to this learning objective was not taught in class and students were not assessed on this outcome.

### 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 75% on exam questions related to the measure.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

Due to lack of class time, material pertaining to this learning objective was not taught in class and students were not assessed on this outcome.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

A score of at least 75% on exam questions related to the measure.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

Due to lack of class time, material pertaining to this learning objective was not taught in class and students were not assessed on this outcome.

### 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**

An average class score of 75% or higher in final exam questions pertaining to this objective

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The average class was 83%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

An average class score of 75% or higher in final exam questions pertaining to this objective

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The average class was 83%.

### M 21: Acct 4610: Apply the opinion formulation process (O: 1, 2)

**Acct 4610:** Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

An average score of at least 75% on final exam questions

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The average score was 86%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**

An average score of at least 75% on final exam questions

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The average score was 86%.
### 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 80% or better on a a semester long project using audit software

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  All students scored 80% or better on this project.

- **Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
  A score of 80% or better on a a semester long project using audit software

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  All students scored 80% or better on this project.

### M 23: Acct 4410: Read and interpret financial statements (O: 1, 2)
Acct 4410: 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

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  The mean score was 76%. Although overall, the target was met, average score was below the 75% target on certain topics like pensions, income taxes, statement of cash flows, contingent liabilities, earnings per share, derivatives, and stock options.

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

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  The mean score was 76%. Although overall, the target was met, average score was below the 75% target on certain topics like pensions, income taxes, statement of cash flows, contingent liabilities, earnings per share, derivatives, and stock options.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  The mean score was 74%. Overall, the target was not met. Furthermore, average score was way below the 75% target on certain topics like pensions, income taxes, statement of cash flows, contingent liabilities, earnings per share, derivatives, and stock options.

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

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  The mean score was 74%. Overall, the target was not met. Furthermore, average score was way below the 75% target on certain topics like pensions, income taxes, statement of cash flows, contingent liabilities, earnings per share, derivatives, and stock options.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  The average score was 78%.

- **Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Skills**
A score of at least 75% on individual projects.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 2102: Develop accounting information | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Measure: Acct 2102: Document accounting usefulness | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| 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
Additional Resources: RPG Grant from Provost’s office. Resources for hiring peer tutors.

Actions for ACCT2101 and ACCT2102
Several changes are being planned for 2008/2009 in acct 2101. The first is that we hope to have supplemental instruction for the course. This would allow students the opportunity to get repetition of the material covered in the lecture. We also plan to experiment with some mini-lectures via video. We will select two chapters to pilot this initiative in 2008/2009. The videos will be posted online so the students can access them whenever they want and however many times they want. Finally, the online quizzes will be dropped as a grading component and instead be practice quizzes. We will scale down the material in the quiz questions so that it more directly relates to the major takeaways in each chapter. Assuming we continue with the in class activity problems, we are considering modifying them to multiple choice format to more closely align with exam questions. The goal for 2008-2009 is to reduce the DFW rate in ACCT2102 to 30% or less while improving the learning in the course objectives. Actions include the following: 1. Reduce the number of questions presented in the “practice quiz” section of the web site and focus on key learning concepts of the course. Emphasize the use of the practice quizzes as another learning aid in the class. 2. Increase the amount of time spent on the cash flow chapter and add more practice exercises in this area. 3. Incorporate several additional lecture and practice problems that require the integration of multiple financial statements to solve the problem. 4. Continue class activities, since this motivates students to come to class, but simplify the activity to utilize less lecture time. 5. During the spring 2009 semester, incorporate the use of the student response pads in the large lecture sessions and eliminate the use of the class activities. The response pads encourage more active participation in the lectures. 6. Record several mini lectures via podcast and add to web site.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2008, Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark, Kathy Partridge

Actions for ACCT4210
We will adopt a new text for Fall 2008 to replace the text we adopted in Fall 2006. We had adopted the current text, which emphasizes ambiguity in problem solving, to encourage development of higher level analytical skills. However, assessment results suggest that this approach hinders student learning of technical concepts. Thus, we are returning to a more traditional text.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 4210: Evaluate alternative costing systems | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Measure: Acct 4210: Structure and model business problems | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lynn Hannan
Actions for ACCT4310
Increase the time for students to work on the case.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 4310: Evaluate internal control | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2008, Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faye Borthick

Actions for ACCT4510
Refine lecture notes for the sub-measures which are below target. Spend more class time on sub-measures which are below target.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Acct 4510: Apply tax law to investment decisions | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Measure: Acct 4510: Identify tax issues | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Measure: Acct 4510: Select and apply tax laws | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Skills
| Technical Accounting Knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2008, Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

Revise curriculum
In ACCT4110, which pertains to learning outcomes #18 and #19, instructors were unable to cover the material pertaining to these two objectives due to lack of class time. The curriculum needs to be revised to include more hours of financial accounting so that these two measures can be covered. In ACCT4410, which pertains to learning objectives #23 and #24, student performance was below the target for topics which were not covered in ACCT4110. This again shows the need to revise the curriculum to include more hours of financial accounting.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
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 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, Spring 2009
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?
In ACCT2101 (LO #1, #2 and #3) in Fall 2007, 73% of the students passed the class, which is a big improvement over the historical pass rate of 55-60%. During Fall 2007 (Spring 2008), 46 (62) students participated in the peer tutoring initiative with a pass rate of 70% (61%). Although these pass rates are less than the overall class pass rate, it should be remembered that students participating in the peer tutoring initiative are generally the weaker students who either failed the course or withdrew from the course in a previous semester. In ACCT4310 we learnt that students can develop the skills for identifying process relationships provided they refrain from giving up too soon when working with complex, unstructured materials. Also in this course students perform better if more guidance is provided at first for tasks requiring critical thinking. In ACCT4510, revising the lecture notes appears to have a substantial impact on the number of sub-learning objectives falling below target. In ACCT4110, it is very disturbing that material pertaining to two Learning Outcomes (#18 and #19) was not able to be covered in class due to lack of class time. Also in ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Learning Outcomes #23 and #24. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you don’t know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate level (ACCT8700) we also need to think about whether a course like ACCT4410 is needed at the undergraduate level. It is very disappointing that the attempt to develop higher level analytical skills in ACCT4210 by adopting a new text in Fall 2006 did not succeed.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
ACCT2101 and 2102 will need continuous attention and experimentation. So will ACCT4310. We need to think about how to introduce ambiguity in problem solving and how to develop higher level analytical skills in ACCT4210. The challenges in ACCT4210 are unique because it is a required class for Accounting and Finance majors. The challenge is to design a course which will meet the needs of both accounting and finance majors. Going back to a traditional text (which is already included in the Action Plan) and then having supplementary instructor prepared material for the higher level analytical skills may help.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SLO 1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

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**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**SLO 2: Success on professional exams (M: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9)**

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**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**SLO 3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**SLO 5: Structure and solve problems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 4: 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: AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 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**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 FM and to a lesser extent MLC, (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**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 FM and to a lesser extent MLC, (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**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 FM and to a lesser extent MLC, (2) understanding actuarial valuation principles, and (3) performing valuation calculations using various tools including actuarial mathematics and Microsoft Excel.

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 FM and to a lesser extent MLC, (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**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams in the AS 4340 Life Contingencies course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 FM and to a lesser extent MLC, (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.
Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (mean = 3.91 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. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year’s (mean = 3.32). No core areas fell below the 3.0 threshold.

>>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (mean = 3.91 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. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year’s (mean = 3.32). No core areas fell below the 3.0 threshold.

>>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (mean = 3.91 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. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year’s (mean = 3.32). No core areas fell below the 3.0 threshold.

>>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (mean = 3.91 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. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year’s (mean = 3.32). No core areas fell below the 3.0 threshold.

>>SURVEY RESULTS

M 3: Graduating Student Survey - AS Related Knowledge (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

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

Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory

Graduating students will report that the AS program provided them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Graduating students will rate every area 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (overall mean = 3.81 on a 5-point scale), in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year, as no area fell below the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Target for O2: Success on professional exams

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (overall mean = 3.81 on a 5-point scale), in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year, as no area fell below the 3.0 threshold. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (mean = 3.91 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. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year’s (mean = 3.32). No core areas fell below the 3.0 threshold.
Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (overall mean = 3.81 on a 5-point scale), in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year, as no area fell below the 3.0 threshold. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (overall mean = 3.81 on a 5-point scale), in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year, as no area fell below the 3.0 threshold. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated the AS Program substantially above average, overall (overall mean = 3.81 on a 5-point scale), in terms of providing the level of proficiency in AS related knowledge necessary to succeed in business. These results represent a substantial improvement from last year, as no area fell below the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 4: Graduating Student Survey - Program Services (O: 1, 2, 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 O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services substantially above average for college/university level services (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.75). Both averages represent a marked improvement from last year’s respective averages of 3.24 and 3.29. At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Target for O2: Success on professional exams
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services substantially above average for college/university level services (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.75). Both averages represent a marked improvement from last year’s respective averages of 3.24 and 3.29. At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services substantially above average for college/university level services (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.75). Both averages represent a marked improvement from last year’s respective averages of 3.24 and 3.29. At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating students rated AS program services substantially above average for college/university level services (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.75). Both averages represent a marked improvement from last year’s respective averages of 3.24 and 3.29. At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

Target for O5: Structure and solve problems
Graduating students will rate individual services 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students rated AS program services substantially above average for college/university level services (mean = 3.67 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.75). Both averages represent a marked improvement from last year’s respective averages of 3.24 and 3.29. At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 5: 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

The Panel will report that the Actuarial Science Program is relevant to the needs of employers and that our graduates/students have a good probability of finding employment in high level positions/internships within firms.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

An AS Industry Panel was convened to formally assess the contributions made by Georgia State University’s Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education. The Panel has been scheduled to meet in mid-September and will provide suggestions for improvement of the program and areas of possible future development.

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.

M 6: Professional Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Upon graduation, the majority of our BBA-AS students will have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM). This generally meets employer expectations for entry-level actuarial jobs. The BBA-AS curriculum not only prepares students for the SOA exam requirements, but also expands their scope of knowledge by including cutting-edge, relevant topics such as financial and quantitative risk management.

Target for O1: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory

The AS Program Director will report that, upon graduation, the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The AS Program Director reported that the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM) and are now better prepared for entry-level actuarial jobs and are more attractive to employers.

Target for O2: Success on professional exams

The AS Program Director will report that, upon graduation, the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The AS Program Director reported that the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM) and are now better prepared for entry-level actuarial jobs and are more attractive to employers.

Target for O3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials

The AS Program Director will report that, upon graduation, the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The AS Program Director reported that the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM) and are now better prepared for entry-level actuarial jobs and are more attractive to employers.

Target for O4: Relevance to employers

The AS Program Director will report that, upon graduation, the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The AS Program Director reported that the majority of this year’s BBA-AS graduates have passed the first two Society of Actuaries exams (Exam P and Exam FM) and are now better prepared for entry-level actuarial jobs and are more attractive to employers.
**M 8: Alumni Survey - AS Related Knowledge (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered by mail to alumni, two and three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey their attitudes toward the content of the program, the program’s effect on their career competency, their assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and their rating of various college/university/department services. This section of the survey asks alumni 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 O5: Structure and solve problems

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### Target for O6: Relevance to employers

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### Target for O7: Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### Target for O8: Success on professional exams

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### Target for O4: Relevance to employers

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### M 7: Alumni Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered by mail to alumni, two and three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey their attitudes toward the content of the program, the program’s effect on their career competency, their assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and their rating of various college/university/department services. This section of the survey asks alumni 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

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction (overall mean = 4.19 on a 5-point scale) with the AS Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across various core business knowledge/skill areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### Target for O2: Success on professional exams

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

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. >>SURVEY RESULTS
Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. 

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

Alumni 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. 

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Alumni 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. 

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

Alumni 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied (overall mean = 3.96 on a 5-point scale) with the BBA-AS Program, in terms of providing the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in business, across multiple areas of actuarial science related knowledge. Alumni rated every area well above the 3.0 threshold. 

**M 9: Alumni Survey - Program Services (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

On an annual basis, a written questionnaire survey will be administered by mail to alumni, two and three years removed from graduation. The questions will survey their attitudes toward the content of the program, the program’s effect on their career competency, their assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and their rating of various college/university/department services. This section of the survey asks alumni to rate their satisfaction with various college/university services as well as various department level services.

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

Alumni will rate all AS program services (university/college/department levels) as above average with a numeric score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni rated AS program services substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.73 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.88). At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. 

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

Alumni will rate all AS program services (university/college/department levels) as above average with a numeric score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni rated AS program services substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.73 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.88). At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. 

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

Alumni will rate all AS program services (university/college/department levels) as above average with a numeric score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni rated AS program services substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.73 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.88). At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. 

**Target for O4: Relevance to employers**

Alumni will rate all AS program services (university/college/department levels) as above average with a numeric score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Alumni rated AS program services substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.73 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.88). At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

Alumni will rate all AS program services (university/college/department levels) as above average with a numeric score of 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni rated AS program services substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.73 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.88). At the university level, library services were rated the highest. At the department level, professional exam preparation received the highest rating. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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

**Create Industry Panel**

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

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

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

**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

**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

**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: AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course  
  | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  
  | Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory | Structure and solve problems | Success on professional exams
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- 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

**Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs**
The department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. Her duties include: (1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students; (2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department; and (3) provide dedicated staff support for the department’s scholarship award process.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Services  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Program Services  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips/Ednisha Riley

**Conduct meeting with Biennial Industry Panel**
An AS Industry Panel was convened to formally assess the contributions made by Georgia State University’s Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education. The Panel has been scheduled to meet in mid-September and will provide suggestions for improvement of the program and areas of possible future development.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers

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

**Content of AS curriculum**
As faculty will review and consider revising the content of the AS curriculum to further improve computer proficiency, business communication, and student presentation skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Alumni Survey - AS Related Knowledge  
  | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  
  | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills  
  | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  
  | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel  
  | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - AS Related Knowledge  
  | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  
  | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills  
  | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials  
  | Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
Growing number of AS majors

The growing numbers of AS majors are creating some resource issues. This needs to be examined by the department leadership within the next few years.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008

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 - AS Related Knowledge</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 4340 Life Contingencies Course</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial Industry Panel</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Survey - AS Related Knowledge</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Exams</td>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies and risk theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Exams</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Success on professional exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Core Knowledge/Skills</td>
<td>Success on professional exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Services</td>
<td>Success on professional exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Exams</td>
<td>Success on professional exams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: 2009-2010 academic year

Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips/faculty leaders

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Last year, the BBA-AS program attracted an increased number of quality students who are generally pleased with the department's course offerings and services. Our graduating students and alumni are highly satisfied with the curriculum, in terms of adding value to their careers and professional opportunities. The curriculum now includes added financial risk modeling components, and we are looking to further increase our offerings in this area.

Students have demonstrated success in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding well-paying jobs upon graduation. The content of AS 4350 was further revised to improve areas of (1) computer proficiency, (2) professional writing, (3) project/technology management, and (4) entrepreneurship, making our graduates even more attractive to potential employers. The department added several new AS faculty, who are already adding value to the student experience at Georgia State.

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

The growing numbers of AS majors are creating some resource issues. This needs to be examined by the department leadership within the next few years. While we have made some progress to improve and strengthen our student's communication skills, there remains a need to further strengthen written communication skills and the management of technology across the BBA-AS curriculum. We are 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 was identified, but failed to meet during the current assessment period.

The Panel has been scheduled to meet in mid-September and their report will be included in the 2009-2010 assessment report.
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: 8, 10)**
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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 2: Success on professional exams (M: 8, 10)**
Pass rates on professional actuarial science exams C, MLC, and MFE for Georgia State University students will be consistently higher than the national averages.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 3: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials (M: 8, 9, 10)**
The MAS graduate will be able to comprehend the theoretical and technical material in appropriate actuarial journals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 4: Explanation of technical concepts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12)**
The MAS graduate will be able to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 5: Structure and solve problems (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12)**
The MAS graduate will be able to structure and solve actuarial and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.
Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Relevance to employers (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12)
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
The Panel will report that the Actuarial Science Program is relevant to the needs of employers and that our graduates/students have a good probability of finding employment in high level positions/internships within firms.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The Panel has been selected and is scheduled to meet in mid-September 2008, too late for their report to be included in the overall 2007-2008 assessment report. The department will include the Panel’s findings on the 2008-2009 assessment report.

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.

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.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.17 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which actuarial science courses have contributed to their AS competency, slightly higher than last year’s 4.10 average. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.17 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which actuarial science courses have contributed to their AS competency, slightly higher than last year’s 4.10 average. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students report a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.17 on a 5-point scale) with the extent to which actuarial science courses have contributed to their AS competency, slightly higher than last year’s 4.10 average. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.17 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.50). Both of these averages are higher than last year’s. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.54 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.50). Both of these averages are higher than last year’s. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.54 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.50). Both of these averages are higher than last year’s. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.05 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. This represents a substantial improvement from last year’s average of 3.69. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.05 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. This represents a substantial improvement from last year’s average of 3.69. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Graduating MAS students reported a high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.05 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. This represents a substantial improvement from last year’s average of 3.69. >>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 8910 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

As is typical every year, the highest rated program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) activities for alumni. These were the only two suggestions that received any substantial support. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

As is typical every year, the highest rated program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) activities for alumni. These were the only two suggestions that received any substantial support. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

As is typical every year, the highest rated program changes were (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) activities for alumni. These were the only two suggestions that received any substantial support. >>SURVEY RESULTS

### M 6: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.93 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average, with a mean of 3.50 or higher, except "use of cases" (mean = 3.33) and "enhancement of computer skills" (mean = 3.42). >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.93 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average, with a mean of 3.50 or higher, except "use of cases" (mean = 3.33) and "enhancement of computer skills" (mean = 3.42). >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.93 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average, with a mean of 3.50 or higher, except "use of cases" (mean = 3.33) and "enhancement of computer skills" (mean = 3.42). >>SURVEY RESULTS

### M 7: 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 report satisfaction (an average score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) across multiple attributes of the program.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

MAS alumni reported above average satisfaction (mean = 3.93 on a 5-point scale) across a variety of program attributes. Every attribute was rated above average, with a mean of 3.50 or higher, except "use of cases" (mean = 3.33) and "enhancement of computer skills" (mean = 3.42). >>SURVEY RESULTS
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
MAS alumni would like to see (1) additional emphasis on job placement and (2) additional activities for alumni. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 8: 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. Additionally, the job placement ratio of GSU students will be higher than that of students at other peer institutions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
From Society of Actuaries records and through informal polling of graduating students, the AS Program Director reports that Georgia State’s MAS students’ exam passing ratio appears to be consistently better than the reported national average for Exams C, MLC, and MFE. The Program Director also reports that it appears that GSU has better job placement ratio than other actuarial programs in the nation.

**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. Additionally, the job placement ratio of GSU students will be higher than that of students at other peer institutions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
From Society of Actuaries records and through informal polling of graduating students, the AS Program Director reports that Georgia State’s MAS students’ exam passing ratio appears to be consistently better than the reported national average for Exams C, MLC, and MFE. The Program Director also reports that it appears that GSU has better job placement ratio than other actuarial programs in the nation.

**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. Additionally, the job placement ratio of GSU students will be higher than that of students at other peer institutions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
From Society of Actuaries records and through informal polling of graduating students, the AS Program Director reports that Georgia State’s MAS students’ exam passing ratio appears to be consistently better than the reported national average for Exams C, MLC, and MFE. The Program Director also reports that it appears that GSU has better job placement ratio than other actuarial programs in the nation.

**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. Additionally, the job placement ratio of GSU students will be higher than that of students at other peer institutions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
From Society of Actuaries records and through informal polling of graduating students, the AS Program Director reports that Georgia State’s MAS students’ exam passing ratio appears to be consistently better than the reported national average for Exams C, MLC, and MFE. The Program Director also reports that it appears that GSU has better job placement ratio than other actuarial programs in the nation.

**M 9: 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 2007-2008 - 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 (25 students, in 8 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., two teams on property-casualty insurance; two teams on life insurance risk modeling; 2 teams on currency exchange risk; one team on Solvency II; one team on regime-shifting models). 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 2007-2008 - 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 (25 students, in 8 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., two teams on property-casualty insurance; two teams on life insurance risk modeling; 2 teams on currency exchange risk; one team on Solvency II; one team on regime-shifting models). 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 2007-2008 - 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 (25 students, in 8 teams) that are very topical in nature (e.g., two teams on property-casualty insurance; two teams on life insurance risk modeling; 2 teams on currency exchange risk; one team on Solvency II; one team on regime-shifting models). 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 10: 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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.

**M 11: Alumni Survey - AS Competency (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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. This is an improvement from last year's average of 4.0. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. This is an improvement from last year's average of 4.0. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Alumni were highly satisfied (mean = 4.13 on a 5-point scale) with the degree to which AS courses have contributed to their actuarial science competency. This is an improvement from last year's average of 4.0. >>SURVEY RESULTS

**M 12: Alumni Survey - Career Preparation (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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni reported a very high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.75 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.42 on a 5-point scale). This is a marked improvement of last year’s averages.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni reported a very high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.75 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.42 on a 5-point scale). This is a marked improvement of last year’s averages.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
MAS alumni reported a very high level of satisfaction with their overall career preparation (mean = 4.75 on a 5-point scale) and the enhancement of career opportunities provided by the program (mean = 4.42 on a 5-point scale). This is a marked improvement of last year’s averages.

**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/casually 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
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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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
The department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. Her duties include:(1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students;(2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department;(3) work closely with the Office of Graduate Admissions to manage the graduate(MS/MAS) application process; and(4) provide dedicated staff support for the department’s scholarship award process.

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

Conduct a meeting of the AS Industry Panel
An AS Industry Panel was convened to formally assess the contributions made by Georgia State University’s Actuarial Science Program to actuarial education. The Panel has been scheduled to meet in mid-September and will provide suggestions for improvement of the program and areas of possible future development.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Explanation of technical concepts

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

Offer two sessions of AS 8810
For the 2008-2009 academic year, the department will offer two sessions (Fall session and Spring session) of the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar. This is to allow for greater faculty interaction with students and more hands-on supervision of their team projects. This will also give MAS students more flexibility in planning their course sequencing and timely graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: AS 8810 Graduate Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
  | Explanation of technical concepts | Structure and solve problems

Implementation Description: Fall 2008 and Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang/members of AS faculty
Additional Resources: We will need additional tenure track faculty that specialize in actuarial science and related fields.

Suggested program changes by alumni
Survey results revealed that alumni and graduating students would like to see additional emphasis on job placement and increased activities for alumni. This summer, the RMI Department hired an Administrative Assistant-Student Affairs to serve as the point of contact for all student activities and needs. She will work with the AS Program Director to address these needs.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2008-2009 academic year
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?
During the last academic year, the MAS program has attracted an increased number of top students, who are generally pleased with the department's course offerings and services. In terms of incoming GMAT scores, MAS students continue to have the highest scores of any program in the Robinson College of Business. The content of AS 8810 Actuarial Science Graduate Seminar was...
further revised to include additional writing assignments, team presentation projects, and expanded coverage of international topics. Furthermore, starting with the 2008-2009 academic year, the department will offer two sessions (fall and spring) of the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar. This will allow for greater faculty interaction with students and more hands-on supervision of their team projects. This will also give MAS students more flexibility in planning their course sequencing and timely graduation. AS 8340 Life Contingencies was further revised to include more computer-based applications and assignments. MAS students have demonstrated success in passing professional actuarial exams and in finding well-paying jobs upon graduation. The department has further increased its support of and guidance to the Actuarial Student Association by hiring an Administrative Specialist – Student Affairs. This person will design and execute activities through the student organizations that will add value to the student experience. This person will also work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate placement efforts and add value to the AS Job Fair.

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. As was the case last year, there remains a need to further strengthen written and oral communication skills, overall, across the MAS curriculum. We are continuing to revise the curriculum to require additional presentations and writing projects in all graduate level courses. The department's Director of Student and External Affairs recently resigned from this important position that must be filled during the 2008-2009 academic year. Some of the duties will be performed by the new Administrative Specialist – Student Affairs, who will work closely with the faculty and staff to develop attractive alumni activities that hopefully will enliven this important constituency. The Biennial Industry Panel responsible for assessing the actuarial science program's contributions to actuarial education and relevancy to employers, was identified but failed to meet during the current assessment period. The Panel has been scheduled to meet in mid-September. Their report will be included in the 2009-2010 assessment report. Like last year, we will 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.
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Mission / Purpose

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Communication Skills (M: 3)
A. Students develop effective written communication skills

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4. Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Analytical Skills (M: 1, 2)
A. Students acquire the skills to collect data.
B. Students are able to explain and interpret interdisciplinary scholarship.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4. Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Collecting Data (O: 3)
A rating of excellent (5): Students identify, operationalize and collect primary data. Students use multiple levels of data. A rating of very good (4): Students identify, operationalize and collect primary data that are not random. A rating of good (3): Students utilize
secondary data. A rating of fair (2): Paper reflects the collection of data but data are not used to support conclusions. A rating of poor (1): Paper lacks data.

**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).

**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).

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills**
80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on understanding interdisciplinary measures. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

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

**Target for O1: Communication Skills**
80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on effective written communication skills. The mean rating average of this dimension will be at least 3.0 (good).

**M 4: Application of Data (O: 2)**

**Target for O2: Acquisition of Knowledge**
80% of the papers will receive a rating of good on application of the data.

**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

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

- **Measure:** Effective Written Communication Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Communication Skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Committee

**Additional Resources:** None needed

**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  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Interdisciplinary Measure  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge | Analytical Skills  
**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 increase writing assignments in AAS elective coursework.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Effective Written Communication Skills  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Communication Skills  
**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  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Interdisciplinary Measure  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge | Analytical Skills  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment committee  
**Additional Resources:** None needed

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 Anthropology Assessment of Core**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Anthropology Department participates in the general education core curriculum by offering its signature course, Anth 1102: Introduction to Anthropology. The course elucidates the comparative study of humanity across time and space by offering (1) a holistic understanding of human diversity that requires the study of biological, archaeological, social/cultural, and linguistic anthropology; (2) a cross-cultural and comparative study of humanity; and (3) a consideration of human problems within historical, environmental, political-economic, and sociocultural contexts. Students are given an overview of anthropological research strategies, theories, and practices. Topical foci include human evolution, primate behavior, human variation, prehistory and 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, and social reform. The course is an option to satisfy Area E of the core curriculum because contemporary and past cultures and societies, and their precursors, are covered in global and local contexts.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critique of the race concept (M: 2)**

This indicator of performance was devised to assess how well students obtain critical thinking skills in Anth 1102 (Introduction to Anthropology). Students are introduced to applying the scientific method, the natural history of humans, and human variation to critique the race concept. This outcome is aligned with a number of institutional priorities including learning about the global and cultural reality of human variation, creative expression in essay format and positioning the self with respect to human biodiversity.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 2: The biocultural evolution of humans (M: 1)

The biocultural evolution of the human species is described in lecture and in the textbook. Students are given the opportunity to creatively respond in writing to an extra credit question on the first midterm exam. The question prompts students to explain the consequences of stone tool technology, food sharing, subsistence strategies and long term social group formation. The extra credit scoring of this measure is expected to reduce grade inflation.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: The biocultural evolution of humans (O: 2)

Students are given the opportunity to creatively respond in writing to an extra credit question on the first midterm exam. The students are asked to describe the biocultural evolution of humanity with reference to changes in subsistence and survival strategies. The points for this essay served as a weighted curve to the exam, and the highest possible score was a ten as the highest score on the midterm was 90%.

**Target for O2: The biocultural evolution of humans**

It was expected that, out of a 10 point scale, students would on average receive a 7.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The average score on these essays was 55% but this score is misleading since nearly a third of the students opted not to write an extra credit essay. Students were given partial credit for incomplete answers. These extra credit essays were unlikely candidates for grade inflation, as the scores were essentially a curve to the first midterm exam. The fact that the average is about 20 percentage points lower than the target will be brought before the departmental faculty at the next meeting.

#### M 2: Critique of the race concept (O: 1)

Student must respond to lectures, film clip, readings and classroom discussions to critique the (non) biology of race in essay format. Students must write 3-4 pages responding to at least two out of the three questions provided.

**Target for O1: Critique of the race concept**

It was expected that students will score on average 80% on the essays based on previous uses of this measure.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students scored an average of 18.3 out of 20 points possible (91%). The scores ranged from 16.5 to 20 and the scores were slightly lower in the fall than in the spring semester. The students surpassed the target performance level suggesting that either the essays suffered from grade inflation, or alternatively that the students were able to successfully critique the race concept after the lectures, film clip, readings and class discussions. These two interpretations of the discrepancy between the expected and observed will be discussed at the next faculty meeting.

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

#### Discussion at faculty meeting

The faculty will discuss whether the higher than expected scores on the essays critiquing the race concept is because of grade inflation or rather that students actually utilized their critical thinking skills successfully. The faculty will also discuss the efficacy of this measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critique of the race concept | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Departmental faculty

#### Faculty discussion

At the next meeting, departmental faculty will discuss whether the target level for this extra credit essay was too ambitious. The faculty will also consider additional options to satisfy the assessment of critical thinking skills for the course. Furthermore, the merits and minuses of assessing outcomes using extra credit points will be brought before the faculty.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This year the assessment of critical thinking in Anth 1102: Introduction to Anthropology employed two measures to evaluate student performance. For at least one of the measures, students exceeded their expected performance. While the format for grading the essays may have inflated the scores, it is also entirely possible that the students were successful at mastering the ability to think critically about the categorical race concept as it is applied to human variation. If the later is correct then the measure aptly demonstrates the success of the course in allowing students to exercise their critical thinking skills. It may be that the extra credit essay points on the first midterm added substantially to evaluating the learning outcomes by being more parsimonious than standard grading. The topic certainly warrants faculty discussion and feedback.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The target was not met for the second measure used to evaluate critical thinking skills. Designing appropriate and transparent outcome assessments, that also sharpen writing skills, can be challenging, and the faculty may decide through discussion to eliminate the extra credit essay from future evaluations. Alternatively, a better way of assessing the outcomes could be designed to more accurately reflect the extent to which students are attaining critical thinking skills in the course. Departmental faculty will discuss these options at the next meeting in August 2008.
### SLO 2: Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 2)

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**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

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

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**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 4)

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**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge (M: 5)

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**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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 2007-2008 - 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 lower 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. Link to data table.

**M 2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Student critical thinking skills were evaluated as excellent or close to excellent across the board. The emphasis of critical thinking in anthropological inquiry perhaps helps to explain the ranking of student achievement for this cluster of outcomes. Link to data table.

**M 3: 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students received primarily excellent, or close to excellent scores for the communications skills cluster. One important exception to this trend is in the area of writing skills. As discussed in the analysis, these skills will perhaps be enhanced with the implementation of the QEP for the CAS in 2009. Link to data table.

**M 4: Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (O: 4)**  
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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students generally performed well in this cluster, although mastering key concepts in anthropology was ranked slightly lower than the other two outcomes in the cluster. Understanding the basis of social inequality, a core concept in anthropology is heavily emphasized in the curriculum and the students were uniformly ranked as excellent for this learning outcome. Link to data table.
### M 5: 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 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.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students were ranked as close to excellent in being trained in basic anthropological methods. Students were ranked lower, between excellent and good, for their ability to apply anthropology to the real world. The latter outcome was ranked higher in the assessment cycle for 2007 and the differences in the two years is explored in the analysis section. Link to data 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.

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

#### 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.

**Details**
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frank Williams

#### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Cluster 1: Analytical Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 1: Analytical Skills
- **Measure:** Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 2: Critical Thinking Skills
- **Measure:** Cluster 3: Communication Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 3: Communication Skills
- **Measure:** Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 4: Acquisition of Knowledge
- **Measure:** Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 5: Application of Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department of Anthropology

#### Discussion of student ability to identify themes

At the next meeting, the faculty will discuss how to improve student ability to identify major themes in the literature.

**Details**
- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Cluster 1: Analytical Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Cluster 1: Analytical Skills

**Implementation Description:** August 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Departmental faculty

#### Discussion related to student writing skills

The faculty will discuss how to improve student writing skills at the first meeting of next semester.

**Details**
- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
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 need-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. Students who obtain a MA in anthropology pursue doctoral studies, or seek employment as professional anthropologists with museums, CRM firms, the CDC, and various NGOs.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Measure 2: Thesis or practicum paper (M: 2)

The learning outcomes for the graduate students are based on students' performance in the thesis or practicum paper. The thesis or practicum paper is also required for graduation, and is usually completed and defended in the fourth and last semester.

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Measure 1: Comprehensive exams (M: 1)

The learning outcomes for the graduate students are based on students' performance in the comprehensive examination. The comprehensive exam is required of all of graduate students, and is normally taken in the third semester of the MA program.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessing Outcomes using the Comprehensive Exam (O: 2)
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 O2: Measure 1: Comprehensive exams
Ninety percent of the students were expected to pass the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Twelve students took the exam in the AA 2007-2008. 11 students passed the comprehensive exam at the first attempt. One student had to re-take her exam, but passed it at the second attempt. One student delayed taking the exam until her fourth semester, but graduated in the same semester.

M 2: Assessing outcomes using the thesis or practicum (O: 1)
In their theses and practicum papers, students have the ability to design and conduct original research, along with an in-depth understanding of the field of inquiry, theory and methods pertaining to the research, and proficiency in the writing conventions and formats of the discipline. Students' theses and practicum papers are evaluated by a committee consisting of three regular university faculty members, at least two of whom must be Department faculty members. Students must orally defend the thesis or practicum paper before their committee. The advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the thesis or practicum paper as a pass, contingent pass or fail. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who wrote and defended a thesis or practicum paper, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the oral defense on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the defense, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the defense and graduated.

Target for O1: Measure 2: Thesis or practicum paper
Ninety-five percent of students were expected to complete and successfully defend their theses or practicum papers.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Twelve students were expected to complete and successfully defend their theses or practicum papers. Out of these, 10 students completed and defended their thesis or practicum in their fourth semester. One student was been asked to substantially revise his thesis, and had to postpone his graduation by one semester. One part-time student completed and defended her practicum paper in her seventh semester, as she had planned in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies at the beginning of her graduate career.

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
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate faculty of the Department of Anthropology
Increasing advising efforts
Faculty encouragement to take the comprehensive exam during the student’s third semester and to complete the thesis or practicum paper early in the fourth semester will increase the likelihood that all students graduate in their fourth semester. Faculty will increase their individual advising efforts in order to make sure that students progress and graduate according to departmental expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessing Outcomes using the Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Measure 1: Comprehensive exams
- Measure: Assessing outcomes using the thesis or practicum | Outcome/Objective: Measure 2: Thesis or practicum paper

Implementation Description: May 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Departmental faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Twelve students passed the comprehensive exam; twelve students completed and successfully defended their theses and practicum papers. The expectations established beforehand were met and exceeded.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Advising efforts will be amplified individually by the faculty and collectively as a team as reflected in targeted discussions at faculty meetings.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Applied Linguistics BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analyze Process of Language Acquisition (M: 1, 2)
Students acquire the skills to analyze the process of language acquisition.

SLO 2: Language Data Collection Skills (M: 1, 2)
Students acquire the skills to collect data on language structure, acquisition, and use.

SLO 3: Read and Understand Reports/Articles (M: 1, 2)
Students are able to read and understand applied linguistics research reports/articles.

SLO 4: Formulate Questions and Hypotheses (M: 1, 2)
Students formulate research questions and formulate testable hypotheses.

SLO 5: Analyze and Interpret Data (M: 1, 2)
Students are able to analyze and interpret data (hypothesis testing, drawing inferences, formulating conclusions).

SLO 6: Using Results of Analysis (M: 1, 2)
Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 7: Written Communication and Editing Skills (M: 1, 2)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Writing Conventions and Formats (M: 1, 2)</th>
<th>Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9: Understand on Linguistics Core Areas (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10: Key Concepts in Applied Linguistics (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of key concepts in applied linguistics areas such as language acquisition and sociolinguistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 11: Awareness of Linguistic Differences (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate awareness of domestic and international cultural and linguistic differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 12: Apply Analytic Tools of Linguistics (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Students develop the ability to apply the analytic tools of linguistics to the study of real-world language problems such as second language pedagogy, language planning and policy, and intercultural communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 13: Analyze linguistic structure (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Students acquire the skills to analyze language structure (e.g., sound structure, word &amp; sentence structures, discourse structure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: examinations & final projects in required courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**

Final examinations/projects in required courses will be examined for coverage of the learning objectives.

**Target for O1: Analyze Process of Language Acquisition**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

**Target for O2: Language Data Collection Skills**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

**Target for O3: Read and Understand Reports/Articles**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

**Target for O4: Formulate Questions and Hypotheses**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.
## Target for O5: Analyze and Interpret Data

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O6: Using Results of Analysis

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O7: Written Communication and Editing Skills

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O8: Writing Conventions and Formats

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O9: Understand on Linguistics Core Areas

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O10: Key Concepts in Applied Linguistics

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

## Target for O11: Awareness of Linguistic Differences

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The
The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

**Target for O12: Apply Analytic Tools of Linguistics**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

**Target for O13: Analyze linguistic structure**

100% of learning outcomes will be assessed in one or more required courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Complete information was available for 7 of the 9 required courses offered between summer 2007 and spring 2008. The following outcomes were clearly assessed in the final examinations: 1, 6, 10, 11, 12. The instructor for AL 3031 and AL 3041 in Fall 2007 left the university at the end of the semester without leaving behind her examination materials. Thus we can only judge the assessment of learning outcomes by examining the syllabus rather than the final projects. Between these two courses objectives 2, 3, 8, and 9 appear to be covered; it is unclear whether objectives 4, 5, 7, or 13 are assessed in these courses.

We will examine the performance of students on the final examinations and projects for each required course.

**Target for O1: Analyze Process of Language Acquisition**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O2: Language Data Collection Skills**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O3: Read and Understand Reports/Articles**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O4: Formulate Questions and Hypotheses**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O5: Analyze and Interpret Data**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.

**Target for O6: Using Results of Analysis**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Written Communication and Editing Skills**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions and Formats**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Understand on Linguistics Core Areas**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Key Concepts in Applied Linguistics**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Awareness of Linguistic Differences**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Apply Analytic Tools of Linguistics**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Analyze linguistic structure**

80% of students will complete the final exams/projects with a grade of C or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant data were available for 7 of the 9 required courses taught between summer 2007 and spring 2008. In 6 of the 7 courses for which data were available, at least 80% of all students completed the final examination with a grade of C or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**increasing research-related activities in courses**

It is not clear from our assessment that students are gaining sufficient experience in reading published applied linguistics research and carrying out their own research. The undergraduate committee will investigate options for increasing such opportunities within courses and/or within the department in general.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examinations &amp; final projects in required courses</td>
<td>Apply Analytic Tools of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate Questions and Hypotheses</td>
<td>Read and Understand Reports/Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Results of Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** With primary research now required in all AL CTW courses, the second aspect of this action plan has been implemented. With regard to exposure to published research, syllabi for all required AL major courses will be solicited and examined.
reevaluate current measures
In completing our assessment for the first year of our BA program, we realize that our measures are too gross to give us helpful information about improving our curriculum. Thus a committee will reassess the current measures and propose additional measures that can target specific outcomes more effectively.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: New measures were developed and implemented for the new set of objectives revised in the 2011-2012 cycle. As an example, assessments specifically measuring linguistic analysis are used across 3 courses for the program objective on demonstrating linguistic analysis skills.
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy Pickering/Undergraduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
It is clear from the assessment that our students are getting appropriate training in linguistic analysis and are able to apply the principles of analysis to unfamiliar data. Students also gain a broad perspective on cultural and linguistic differences domestically and internationally.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The following outcomes need particular attention in the next cycle: 4, 5, 7, 13. These outcomes relate specifically to understanding and carrying out research in applied linguistics.

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

Mission / Purpose
The Master’s degree in Applied Linguistics integrates the study of linguistic theory with practical applications and focuses on the language acquisition needs of the adult or near-adult learner of an additional language. Students receive the theoretical and practical foundational knowledge needed to teach language at the postsecondary level and to progress to doctoral work in applied linguistics or other language-study or language-teaching related areas.

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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 (M: 7, 8)

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

20 of 21 students received “excellent” or “good” in Connecting Theory to Practice and Scholarship. 19 of 21 received “excellent” or “good” in Writing and “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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

20 of 21 students received “excellent” or “good” in Connecting Theory to Practice and Scholarship. 19 of 21 received “excellent” or “good” in Writing and “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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed requirements.

**Target for O4: Connecting theory and practice**

100% of students will complete this requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed requirements.

**M 3: Professional development activities (O: 7)**

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

**Target for O7: Professional development**

100% of students will complete the PD requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed the PD requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Number of presentations/publications (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisors count the number of conference presentations and/or publications for each student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Professional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of graduating students will have made at least one conference presentation or written at least one published article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of 21 graduating students, only 4 (19%) made conference presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Oral presentation of Master`s paper (O: 5, 6)</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on their presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 of 21 students (95%) scored &quot;good&quot; or excellent on their presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on their presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 of 21 students (95%) scored &quot;good&quot; or excellent on their presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Teaching methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of all students who took the Practicum met the criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of all students who took the Practicum met the criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Teaching methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Cultural knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for <strong>O4: Connecting theory and practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5: Communication</strong></th>
<th>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6: Technology</strong></th>
<th>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7: Professional development</strong></th>
<th>90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for all learning outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>We had a low rate of participation in our alumni survey (9/21 or 43%). The criterion was reached for 4 out of 7 outcomes; outcomes 2, 4, and 7 were lower than 90%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Teaching methodology</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Cultural knowledge</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Connecting theory and practice</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5: Communication</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6: Technology</strong></th>
<th>100% of syllabi for required courses will contain specific learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of syllabi contained specific learning outcomes between summer 2007 and spring 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty development seminars</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2005-2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Survey of graduating students</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> November 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Pat Byrd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 |
Improving instruction in linguistic systems

For the second year in a row, students have not expressed confidence in their ability to understand and describe the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse. Options for addressing this issue include(s) examining the content of required courses that address this outcome (specifically, although not exclusively, General Linguistics, Sound System, and Grammar); consider offering more electives that address this outcome; convening a focus group of students to discuss possible reasons for this result.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Professional development

The faculty will discuss options for encouraging students to attend and present at conferences. We may consider setting a goal for the percentage of students attending conferences and reducing our expectations for the percentage of students presenting at conferences.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Videotaped teaching

While the faculty agree that having students produce a videotape of their teaching is an effective way to address learning outcome #1, not everyone agrees that having the videotape part of the Practicum course is the best way to achieve this. The MA committee will review this issue and make recommendations to the full faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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?

We now have data on student perceptions of the program from the past four 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. As in previous years, 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. Furthermore, faculty have consciously included more technology-related topics in their courses in this past year and we note an increase in student satisfaction in this area.

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

For the past two years the student survey continues to suggest that students are not confident about their ability to understand and describe the linguistic systems of English. This is an area that we plan to devote attention to in the coming cycle. In addition, the professional development component of the program still 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.
**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language at Georgia State University, one of the few departments of its kind in the United States, offers a PhD in applied linguistics to prepare students to conduct research on adult language learning and teaching and to function as graduate-level educators in programs training language education professionals. Students in the program have an opportunity to work with graduate faculty who specialize in various areas of applied linguistics. The faculty are committed to teaching and research productivity, and are especially interested in mentoring and collaborating with novice members of the profession.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics (M: 1, 2, 4)**
Graduates of the program will be familiar with the current state of knowledge in applied linguistics, including the numerous questions that remain to be answered

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3. Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
4. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
5. Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
6. Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
7. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
8. Educational support systems that foster student access and success
9. Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
10. Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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. Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3. Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
4. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
5. Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
6. Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
7. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
8. Educational support systems that foster student access and success
9. Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
10. Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3. Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
4. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
5. Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
6. Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
7. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
8. Educational support systems that foster student access and success
9. Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
10. Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In 2007/08, eight students completed their qualifying paper; all 8 students passed the requirement.

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

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Three students took their comprehensive examinations during the past year and all three passed.

Target for O2: Research methodology
90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Three students took their comprehensive examinations during the past year and all three passed.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
3 students graduated with their PhDs in 2007/08. All three taught at least four semesters and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
3 students graduated with their PhDs in 2007/08. All three taught at least four semesters and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
This year 9 out of 10 full-time PhD students in their second year and beyond presented at least one conference or published a scholarly paper.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
This year 9 out of 10 full-time PhD students in their second year and beyond presented at least one conference or published a scholarly paper.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
This year 9 out of 10 full-time PhD students in their second year and beyond presented at least one conference or published a scholarly paper.

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: Finished
- 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: Terminated
- Priority: Medium
review of program milestones
At present our PhD students have three important milestones to reach before their dissertation: the qualifying paper, the comprehensive exams, and the dissertation proposal. We would like to review these milestones to make sure that they are accomplishing their purposes and that students are not having undue difficulties at any particular stage in their program.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive examinations | Outcome/Objective: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics
- Measure: Qualifying papers | Outcome/Objective: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics

Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: PhD Committee (Stephanie Lindemann, Chair)

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Art and Design Assessment of Core
As of: 12/13/2016 03:12 PM EST

Mission / Purpose
As part of the core curriculum in Area C, AH survey courses seek to impart knowledge, values and skills to undergraduates through the study of global art and visual cultures. Through analytical, historical, critical and appreciative methods of learning, students develop skills applicable to any major, but particularly those in fine arts, social sciences and humanities. It is the mission of the department that AH courses increase intellectual curiosity and initiate a continuing interest in the arts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Critical Thinking in Core (M: 1)
“Critical Thinking” outcomes in Art History Core Courses: students develop critical thinking skills through the evaluation and analysis of visual and textual material. The following discipline-specific critical thinking outcomes relate to the General Education “Critical Thinking” outcomes: 1. Students formulate pertinent questions relevant to the evaluation of a work of art or an art historical problem (Gen Ed “Critical Thinking” Outcome #1). 2. Students discern differences and similarities between works of art through the application of aesthetic, contextual and historical knowledge (Gen Ed “Critical Thinking” Outcomes #1 and #2). 3. Students formulate informed opinions about the value of an art historical interpretation (Gen Ed “Critical Thinking” Outcome #3). 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 (Gen Ed “Critical Thinking” Outcome #4).

Relevant Associations: NASAD

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical thinking in multiple choice exams (O: 1)
Data was collected from two multiple-choice, computer-graded tests, each from a section of Survey II (AH 1750) offered in spring 2008. 71 and 58 students took the tests respectively. Test questions requiring critical thinking were identified (15 out of the 50 questions). The percentage of correct student responses to the 15 questions was averaged. The score was compared to the overall mean test score.

Target for O1: Critical Thinking in Core
Target performance level is 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score for ct questions was 67%, compared to the average test score of 80.5%.

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

Action plan
o meet as an area and 1) evaluate the assessment measures and targets in greater depth and 2) to identify and implement
Instructional changes to improve scores. Possible instructional changes may include: redesigning tests to reflect national standards; dedicating more lecture time to discussion of critical thinking in test format.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critical thinking in multiple choice exams  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Core  
**Implementation Description:** summer 2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Susan Richmond

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Findings indicated a slight decline in outcomes/objectives. It is difficult, however, to determine the extent to which certain variables (e.g., different instructor, different test format) may have contributed to the decline.

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

Assessment indicates that further action will need to be taken to improve scores.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 Art Education BFA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 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  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized  
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level (M: 5)**

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
Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level (M: 6)
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)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: Instructional Planning - Senior Level (M: 7)
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)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Content Knowledge - Technology -Senior Level (M: 9)**

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**

7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 7: Professional Competencies - Senior Level (M: 8)**

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**

2 Oral Communication

3 Collaboration

4 Critical Thinking

5 Contemporary Issues

6 Quantitative Skills

7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 11: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level (M: 10)**

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

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### SLO 12: Written Communication - Senior Level (M: 11)

Four essays submitted explaining four portfolio pieces from four different aesthetic viewpoints including composition, technical skills and craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content.

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

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 8: Praxis I Score (M: 12)

Student must take this exam prior to student teaching and must meet minimum scores on state mandated exam of general education competence in order to be certified.

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

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

#### O/O 10: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major (M: 4)

A transcript is submitted establishing a minimum GPA of 2.5 overall and 3.0 in art classes is required.

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

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Lesson Plan - Sophomore Level (O: 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan that meets the criteria outlined in AE 4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Lesson Planning - Sophomore Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the 18 students evaluated 86% achieved the minimum target score of 3. 84% of the students earned the target score goal of 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Portfolio - Sophomore Level (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio on CD of a minimum of 12 artworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the 18 students evaluated, 74% received the target score goal of 4 and 100% received the minimum score goal of 3 for composition; 78% - 4 and 91% - 3 for technical skills; 70% - 4 and 100% for expressive qualities; 83% - 4 and 100% - 3 for meaning/content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Four Written essays (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four essays written about 4 separate artworks from 4 different aesthetic views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Written Communication - Sophomore Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the 18 students evaluated, 60% earned the target score goal of 4 and 100% the minimum score goal of 3 for addressing composition in their writing; 79% - 4 and 96% - 3 for addressing technical skills; 55% - 4 and 100% for addressing expressive qualities; 83% - 4 and 96% - 3 for meaning/content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Grade Point Average - application to major (O: 10)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum GPA of 2.5 in general education courses A minimum GPA of 3.0 in studio courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O10: Grade Point Average - prior to admission to major</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring from 0-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. Students evaluated were sophomores applying to art education as a major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the 18 students evaluated 100% achieved the minimum overall GPA requirement of 2.5 and 3.0 in art courses. The average overall GPA was 3.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of the 18 students evaluated, 100% earned the target score of 4 for collaboration, 96% - 4 and 4% for initiative, 95% - 4 and 5% -3 for well organized; 83% - 4 and 17% - 3 for punctual/attendance; 96% - 4 and 4% - 3 for professional appearance; 100% - 4 for accepts constructive criticism; 100% -4 for potential for professional growth; and 96% - 4 and 4% - 3 for verbal communication.

### M 6: 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

This measure is repetitive since the portfolio is evaluated in measure 4 and the written essays are evaluated in measure 5. Please refer to these two measures in this regard.

### M 7: 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Students were not evaluated for their lesson plans this year.

### M 8: Professional Competencies - Senior Level (O: 7)

Based on faculty observation.

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

Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Students were not evaluated for their professional competencies this year.

### M 9: 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Students were not evaluated for their content knowledge in technology at the Senior level this year.

### M 10: 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Students were not evaluated for their senior level portfolios this year.

### M 11: Written Communication - Senior Level (O: 12)

Four Written essays submitted on four different artworks in portfolio.

**Target for O12: Written Communication - Senior Level**

Scoring from 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
Students were not evaluated for their written communication at the Senior level this year.

M 12: GACE I scores (O: 8)
Passing scores on GACE 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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students who complete the BFA program passed GACE I exam.

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: Finished
Priority: Medium

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

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

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):
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Technology - Senior Level
- Measure: Portfolio - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Sophomore Level

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Millibrandt, 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):
- Measure: Four Written essays | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Sophomore level
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning - senior level
- Measure: Professional Competencies - Senior Level | 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

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.
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 - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Senior Level
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning - senior level
- Measure: Faculty Observation - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Professional Competencies - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Four Written essays | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Sophomore level
- Measure: Lesson Plan - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning - senior level
- Measure: Portfolio and other course assignments | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Senior Level

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

Remove measure 3 from list.

Since the portfolio elements are addressed in measure 4 and the written essays and addressed in measure 5, it is recommended that measure 3 be eliminated due to its repetitive nature. Constance Thalken will confirm with area faculty the merit of this action.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Sophomore Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Sophomore level
- Measure: Portfolio and other course assignments | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills - Sophomore Level

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Millibrandt as Area Coordinator for Art Education and Constance Thalken for reporting.

Senior level evaluation

No evaluations of senior measures were submitted and so analysis for this year will not be provided. Consultation with area faculty will be scheduled to remedy the situation for next year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge - Portfolio - Senior Level
- Measure: Written Communication - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication - Senior Level
- Measure: Professional Competencies - Senior Level | Outcome/Objective: Professional Competencies - Senior Level

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt as Area Coordinator for Art Education and Constance Thalken for reporting.

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 continue to meet target goals in the areas of content knowledge and professional competency. While the scores for composition, technical skills and expressive qualities are lower than the desired 90% target, the scores are appropriate for students entering a program and in line to take further classes that will expand these skills. A new course that will be offered in fall 2009, Introductory Studio, will be available to Art Education BFA majors and this course should impact the quality of their studio art production at the introductory level to the Art Education BFA program.

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

Written communication received the lowest scores at the entry level of the program. In fall 2008 the new course ART 1050 will be offered to Art Education BFA student and will address critical reading and writing. This course will impact the intellectual development of students at an early stage and should improve the written communication scores at both the entry and exit level to the degree program. The lower scores related to technology will also be impacted by the new Art Education course that will be offered for the first time in fall 2008. This course is modeled on the new ART 3400: Digital Possibilities, which has been designed for studio art majors, and focuses on expanding the use of digital technology as a tool in the creative arts.
# 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

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 2: Expertise in Field (M: 2)

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

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

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Ability to mentor (M: 3)

The educator is responsible for managing and mentoring student learning/development.

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

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Professional Development (M: 4)

The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

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

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 5: Partnerships with Learning Communities (M: 5)**

The educator is a member of one or more learning communities

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis Paper - Part I (O: 1)**

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

**Target for O1: Professional Commitment**

Scoring 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

No students were evaluated for 2007-2008

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

No students were evaluated for 2007-2008.

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

No students were evaluated for 2007-2008.

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students were evaluated for 2007 - 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O5: Partnerships with Learning Communities**
Scoring 1-6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score is 5 for 90% of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students were evaluated for 2007 - 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

*Implementation Description: Early Spring 2007*
*Responsible Person/Group: M. Millbrandt, 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: Partnerships with Learning Communities
- Measure: Interview and Observation | Outcome/Objective: Ability to mentor
- Measure: Thesis Paper - Part I | Outcome/Objective: Expertise in Field
- | Professional Commitment
- 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: Partnerships with Learning Communities
- Measure: Interview and Observation | Outcome/Objective: Ability to mentor
- Measure: Thesis Paper - Part I | Outcome/Objective: Expertise in Field
- | Professional Commitment
- Measure: Thesis Paper - Part II | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development

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

**No students were assessed this year so the action**
No students were assessed this year so the action plan for last year will be reviewed with faculty as to its appropriateness for next year.

*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: Medium*
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Interview | Outcome/Objective: Partnerships with Learning Communities
Measure: Interview and Observation | Outcome/Objective: Ability to mentor
Measure: Thesis Paper - Part I | Outcome/Objective: Expertise in Field
Measure: Professional Commitment
Measure: Thesis Paper - Part II | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development

Implementation Description: Fall and spring 2008-09
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Area Coordinator for Art Education

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
No students were assessed this past year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
No students were assessed this past year and so no updating of analysis is possible. The analysis from last year will guide faculty for the upcoming year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Art History BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

Demonstrates evidence of excellence in all aspects of writing with regard to art history

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

Demonstrates evidence of proficiency in written and verbal communication in a foreign language

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 7: Practice in Studio Art (M: 7)
Applies broad knowledge of studio practices as they relate to art history
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

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

4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. Target level average score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.1. Target level average score goal is 5.

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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.9. Target level average score goal is 5.

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.25. Target level average score goal is 4.5.

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.1. Target level average score goal is 4.5.

**M 5: Exam essay questions and writing project (O: 5)**

Review of exam essay questions and a submitted writing project.

**Target for O5: Written Communication Skills**

Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.25. Target level average score goal is 4.5.

**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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Out of 8 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.4. Target level average score goal is 4.5.

**M 7: Studio Art Practice (O: 7)**

Analysis of performance in required studio courses.

**Target for O7: Practice in Studio Art**

Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The average score was 4.5. The target score goal is 4.5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Out of 7 students evaluated 100% achieved goal with a minimum successful score of 3. Average score was 4.6. Target level average score goal is 4.5.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Data demonstrates that target level of 75% was achieved for 100% of the students.

**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 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  
- **Measure:** Exam in upper-level AH course  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of Specialized Content  
- **Measure:** Language course sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in a Foreign Language  
- **Measure:** Research based exam questions and writing project  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills  
**Implementation Description:** Spring Semester 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Akela Reason, Glenn Gunhouse, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, John Decker  
**Additional Resources:** Area faculty meeting/follow up

Expand critical thinking assessment  
Target of 75% measure of performance was again achieved. Continue the rotation of the critical thinking evaluation to a different instructor’s class. Set target of 75% for this year’s measure of performance. Implement the following instructional changes: greater use of digital technology (e.g., 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  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Maria Gindhart  

**Area faculty meeting**
Area faculty will meet to determine the need to raise the minimum standards for next year in light of achieving minimum standards for two consecutive years. The faculty will determine the points of focus for potential improvement to learning outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** AH 1700, AH 1750, AH 1850  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of Content  
- **Measure:** Exam essay questions and writing project  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills  
- **Measure:** Exam in upper-level AH course  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of Specialized Content  
- **Measure:** Language course sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in a Foreign Language  
- **Measure:** Research based exam questions and writing project  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Akela Reason, Glenn Gunhouse, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, John Decker
different/another instructor’s class. Through rotation the pool of students as well as the effectiveness of instructors teaching critical thinking in the program can be broadened. Target is to maintain 75% under the rotation to a new instructor who will increase their use of digital technology via Powerpoint presentations, online image postings and the School’s ever expanding Artstor database.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Critical Thinking Skills in Core
  Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills in Core Courses
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Akela Reason

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The learning outcome assessments indicate that the students are performing consistently well in all outcomes/objectives areas. Since this is the second consecutive year for such results, faculty may want to verify that their standards for student performance are indeed rigorous and appropriate to the major. Should the 2008-2009 assessment results remain consistent with the present results, it may be appropriate for faculty to raise their target scores.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Primarily the need to determine if the standards for student achievement are appropriately set for a high caliber BA Art History program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Art History MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art History MA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways:
• Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills
• Expand students understanding as scholars and advocates of the visual arts
• Prepare students to be 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)
Broad knowledge of world art history
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Knowledge of Methods and Theories (M: 2)
Knowledge of methods and theories of art history based on exposure to substantive scholarship and research
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### SLO 3: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills (M: 3)

Acquisition of analytical and critical thinking skills relevant to art historical ideas, issues, and provenance and scholarship

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

---

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

---

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

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

The ability to gather relevant art historical evidence

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

---

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

---

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### SLO 5: Written Communication Skills (M: 6)

Evidence of excellence in all aspects of writing with regard to art history

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

---

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

---

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### SLO 6: Oral Communication (M: 7)

Evidence of excellence in all aspects of oral presentation with regard to art history

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

---

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

---

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### SLO 7: Competence in a Foreign Language (M: 8)

Evidence of proficiency in written and oral communication in a foreign language

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 8: Analytical Research Skills (M: 5)
Expertise in critical analysis of research evidence
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
There were 0 students evaluated for this measure 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not 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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
No students went through review of part 2 of the comprehensive exam this year.

M 4: Thesis (O: 4)
Review of thesis

Target for O4: Research Skills
Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
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.

M 5: Thesis (O: 8)
Review of thesis.
| Target for **O8**: Analytical Research Skills |
| Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5 |
| **Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met |
| Out of the 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3. |

**M 6: Thesis (O: 5)**
Review of thesis

| Target for **O5**: Written Communication Skills |
| Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5 |
| **Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met |
| Out of the 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 3.5. |

**M 7: Seminars and/or Student Symposium (O: 6)**
Performance in seminar courses and/or Student Symposium

| Target for **O6**: Oral Communication |
| Scoring 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The minimum score goal is 3. The target score goal is 4.5 |
| **Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met |
| Out of the 2 students evaluated 100% achieved this goal with a minimum score of 3. The average score was 4. |

**M 8: Foreign Language Exam or Course grades (O: 7)**
Results of foreign language test or course grades

| Target for **O7**: Competence in a Foreign Language |
| Scoring 1-2. 1=Not acceptable. 2=Acceptable. The target score goal is 2. |
| **Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Not Met |
| 0 students were evaluated for the foreign language test. |

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

**Area faculty meeting/follow up**
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Foreign Language Exam or Course grades | Outcome/Objective: Competence in a Foreign Language
- Measure: Part 1 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam and AH 8010 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Methods and Theories
- Measure: Seminars and/or Student Symposium | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication
- Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills
- | Written Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** Early Spring Semester 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** G. Gunnhouse, M. Gindhart, M. Hartwig, S. Richmond
**Additional Resources:** As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after area faculty meeting.

**Area faculty meeting/follow up**
Area faculty will meet as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Foreign Language Exam or Course grades | Outcome/Objective: Competence in a Foreign Language
- Measure: Part 1 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Content
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Part 2 of Comprehensive Exam and AH 8010 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Methods and Theories
- Measure: Seminars and/or Student Symposium | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication
- Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills
- | Written Communication Skills

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** G. Gunnhouse, S. Richmond, M. Hartwig, M. Gindhart
**Additional Resources:** FTTT in Renaissance Art in place for 2007-2008 academic year
Area faculty meeting
Area faculty will meet to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve stronger learning outcomes for students in their second year performance

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Seminars and/or Student Symposium | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication
Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Research Skills
| Research Skills | Written Communication Skills

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Akela Reason, Glen Gunnhouse, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, John Decker

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Since there were no first year students in the program to evaluate this year, assessment for measures 1 - 3 and 8 are not applicable. Regarding measures 4 - 7, where the target goal for each measure is 4.5, the average score of 3.5 indicates the performances are not significantly above the minimum score for successful completion of the goals. The higher scores are in oral communication, as based on performances in seminar and the Student Symposium.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Student Symposium is an effective program for improving oral communication skills and should be continued. Research skills of gathering evidence and conducting critical analysis of evidence were the weakest outcomes. Faculty should address strategies for teaching students how to conduct more effective gathering of evidence and exercises to improve the analysis of the evidence so their theses results are stronger.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Astronomy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department’s mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 3)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 1, 4)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

SLO 3: Formulate Research Questions (M: 1, 4)
Students develop research questions appropriate for research.

SLO 4: Data Collection (M: 1, 4)
Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

SLO 5: Data Analysis (M: 1, 4)
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

SLO 6: Future Research (M: 1, 4)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 1, 3)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.
presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their oral presentation dissertation defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.6 out of 5.0.

### M 2: Qualifying Exam 2 (O: 9, 10)
As part of the M.S. program, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. Each Ph.D. student takes a second qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on graduate level astronomy and astrophysics, followed by an oral exam with a committee of four faculty members. Students are advised on their degree progress, and for Ph.D. students, on their preparedness for independent research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Two 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 - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.8 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, Specialized Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.8 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, Specialized Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.8 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, Specialized Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.8 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, Specialized Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six 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 - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.8 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, Specialized Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

M 4: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10)
In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, written communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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 **O8**: Written Communication

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six students were rated by their research committee members (a total of 25 assessments performed) based on their written dissertation after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Motivations and Implications of Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 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.
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):
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Written Communication
- Measure: Dissertation Presentation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Oral Communication
- Measure: Qualifying Exam 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Math Skills and Application
- Measure: Research Advisor | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
  Computer Skills | Oral Communication | Specialized Equipment | Written Communication

Implementation Description: September 30, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chairman Dick Miller and the Department Assessment Committee

Engage Faculty
A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last three 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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Written Communication
- Measure: Dissertation Presentation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Oral Communication
- Measure: Qualifying Exam 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles
  Math Skills and Application
- Measure: Research Advisor | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
  Computer Skills | Oral Communication | Specialized Equipment | Written Communication

Implementation Description: Fall 2008 semester
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brian Thoms

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 (2007/2008 academic year), 6 students received Ph.D. degrees in Astronomy. Findings for all measures of all learning outcomes were 4.3 out of 5.0 or above. No findings were below target values. The highest scores (4.8 or above) were found for Data Collection and Specialized Equipment Skills indicating a program strength in educating practicing researchers. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point, accurate measures of student learning outcomes will required averaging over several years. A compilation of assessment data for three years (covering 12 completed Ph.Ds) shows findings between 4.2 and 4.7 out of 5.0 for all measures of all learning outcomes. The Astronomy Ph.D. program shows strength across the board in all learning outcomes.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The area of weakest performance for 2007/2008 was Motivations and Implications of Research, although the performance was still above target levels.
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; approximately 40 of them completed the program. During 07-08, the BLD certification program had approximately 111 students in the certification program; approximately 48 of them completed 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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 6</strong>: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 7</strong>: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 8</strong>: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 9</strong>: Involves school and community in learning (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 10</strong>: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 1</strong>: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O10: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge</strong></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>

| **Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
Using an N of 55, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 6)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 8)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Practices professional reflection**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% of certification students were rated at or above the expected level. This was for candidates at the practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 9)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Involves school and community in 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Using an N of 55, 91% 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.
Continue to review student advancement.

Continue to review student advancement throughout the program. We will also consider using other ratings beyond STARS for our weaveonline reporting.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- 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: May 30, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators were positive and demonstrated improvement over the previous year in all areas.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
For the 07-08 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty made some revisions in target levels for measures used to determine achievement of student learning outcomes. The BLD faculty increased the target level of achievement from 75% to 90%. Even with this increase, the target level of achievement was met. For the 2008-09 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 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. During 07-08, the BLD Master's program had approximately 33 students in the program, with 10 students graduating with Master’s degrees in BLD from Summer 07 through Spring 2008.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 5: Demonstrate student learning and development (M: 1)**

Educators demonstrate student learning and/or development.

Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 5)**

The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

Relevant Associations: NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 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 1.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With an N of 4, 100% of BLD MED students were rated at or above the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 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 2.
Target for O1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 4, 100% of BLD MED students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 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 3.

Target for O2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 4, 100% of BLD MED students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 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 4.

Target for O3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 4, 100% of BLD MED students were rated at or above the expected level.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 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 5.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 4, 100% of BLD MED 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: Finished
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: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development  
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development  
Measure: Faculty 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: June 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Houchins and BLD program

Monitor and evaluate data for the BLD MEd program
BLD 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. We will also consider using other ratings beyond stars for
our next weaveonline cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate 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 30, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: BLD coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Indicators are most positive in all areas whereas all students met program learning outcomes.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
For the 07-08 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty made some revisions in target levels for measures used to determine achievement of student learning outcomes. The BLD faculty increased the target level of achievement from 75% to 90%. Even with this increase, the target level of achievement was met. For the 2008-09 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Biology Assessment of Core

As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST

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

Mission / Purpose
It is the goal of the Biology Department to provide a comprehensive overview of basic topics in biology. In addition, important skills such as good communication and familiarity with the scientific method as well as increasing interest and confidence in biology are stressed in our core courses.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Determination of reliable sources (M: 1)
Students assess the claims that cell phones can cause brain cancer. They must determine whether their sources are reliable or not and why.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 2: Development of reasonable hypotheses (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)
For each experiment performed in the lab, students write reasonable hypotheses.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

SLO 3: Lab reports (M: 2, 5)
Students will write lab reports for selected experiments.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 4: Application to real life (M: 1, 4)
Students will simulate real life situations (i.e. yogurt making, epidemiological spread of disease, case studies in medicine)
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 6: Content 2 (M: 1, 2)**
Students will understand basic human physiological systems.

**SLO 7: Students will learn to speak effectively (M: 3, 4)**
Students will give presentations of their experimental data.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 5: Content 1 (M: 2)**
Students will have a basic understanding of bacteria and viruses.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Do cell phones cause cancer? (O: 1, 2, 4, 6)**
Students read a variety of information about whether or not cell phones cause cancer and decide which sources are reliable and why. Then, they make a recommendation about use of cell phones based on their research.

**Target for O1: Determination of reliable sources**
75% of students will perform at 80% or better.

- **Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
  92% of students scored 75% or better.

**Target for O2: Development of reasonable hypotheses**
75% of students will perform at 80% or better.

- **Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
  92% of students scored 75% or better.

**Target for O4: Application to real life**
75% of students will perform at 80% or better.

- **Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
  92% of students scored 75% or better.

**Target for O6: Content 2**
75% of students will perform at 80% or better.

- **Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
  92% of students scored 75% or better.

**M 2: Lab reports (O: 2, 3, 5, 6)**
Students write lab reports on two lab experiments

**Target for O2: Development of reasonable hypotheses**
75% of students will score 75% or better on the report.

- **Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
76% scored 75% or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Lab reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 75% or better on the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Content 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 75% or better on the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Content 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 75% or better on the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Lab Presentations (O: 2, 7)**
Students present their experiments orally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Development of reasonable hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% of students scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Students will learn to speak effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% of students scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Oral Communication (O: 4, 7)**
Each student will present a mini lecture and provide a 1-page summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Application to real life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score 80% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% of students scored 80% or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Students will learn to speak effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score 80% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% of students scored 80% or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Written Communication (O: 2, 3)**
Students in BIOL2107K write lab reports on their experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Development of reasonable hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 80% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Lab reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students will score 80% or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students scored 75% or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre and Post Tests
All Core sections will provide an exam at the beginning of the course to assess student knowledge of basic science concepts and will be used as a reference for a similar capstone exam.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Lab Presentations | Outcome/Objective: Development of reasonable hypotheses
- Measure: Lab reports | Outcome/Objective: Development of reasonable hypotheses
- Measure: Oral Communication | Outcome/Objective: Application to real life
- Measure: Written Communication | Outcome/Objective: Development of reasonable hypotheses

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Cruz, Therese Poole, Robert Maxwell

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, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24)
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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Scientific Communication (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 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
- 3 Collaboration

SLO 3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology (M: 5, 6, 8)
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 Technology

SLO 4: Content in Biology (M: 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23, 25)
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: 6, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24)
Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses. Students use the results of analysis to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new questions.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Interpretation of Graphical Information (O: 1)**
Students in Biol 3810 will interpret a graph on enzyme kinetics.

**Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry**
80% of students receive scores of 70% or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
83% of students scored 70% or higher on the question.

**M 2: 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).

**M 3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
A range of 85-90% of students scored 70% or better on performing experiments.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
A range of 85-90% of students scored 70% or better on performing experiments.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
A range of 85-90% of students scored 70% or better on performing experiments.

**M 4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% of students scored 85% or better after one rewrite of the paper.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% of students scored 85% or better after one rewrite of the paper.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% of students scored 85% or better after one rewrite of the paper.

M 5: 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 paper.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of students scored 70% or better on the paper.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of students scored 70% or better on the paper.

M 6: 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
820% of students will score 80% or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
80% of groups had equal participation by all members.

Target for O3: History, Nature and Impact of Biology
820% of students will score 80% or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
80% of groups had equal participation by all members.

Target for O5: Critical thinking
820% of students will score 80% or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
80% of groups had equal participation by all members.

M 7: 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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Range from 26% to 92% on these assignments. Scores did improve throughout the course of the semester.

Target for O4: Content in Biology
75% of students should score 70% or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Range from 26% to 92% on these assignments. Scores did improve throughout the course of the semester.

M 8: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Four questions were asked over the course of the semester. The scores ranged from 42%-90% with scores increasing each time.

### M 9: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In 80% of classes with SI, students received significantly higher grades than those that did not attend SI.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In 80% of classes with SI, students received significantly higher grades than those that did not attend SI.

### M 10: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

81% of students scored 75% or better on this demonstration of skill.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**

70% can score 75% or better

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

81% of students scored 75% or better on this demonstration of skill.

### M 11: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

73% of students were able to score 80% or better.

### M 12: 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.

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

70% of students score 80% or better on the assignment.

### M 13: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
70% of students earned 80% or higher.

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

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
70% of students earned 80% or higher.

### M 14: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of students scored 80% or better.

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

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of students scored 80% or better.

### M 15: 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 16: 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 17: 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 18: 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 19: 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>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Content in Biology</th>
<th>18 of 22 received at least an 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical thinking</th>
<th>18 of 22 received at least an 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Deliver presentations with written abstracts (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student will present a mini lecture and provide 1-page summary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>86% of students scored 80% or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Critique and analyze scientific literature (O: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry</th>
<th>Critique a statement: 70% of students scored 80% or higher Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>Critique a statement: 70% of students scored 80% or higher Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical thinking</th>
<th>Critique a statement: 70% of students scored 80% or higher Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Predict changes that accompany Biological problems (O: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students were expected to critically determine the outcome of different patients' pregnancy tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry</th>
<th>avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical thinking</th>
<th>avg=84.4%, %passing=91.5% avg=86.9%, %passing=95.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: Content: Organismal form and function (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be assessed on their quality of case study presentation to the class. Cases will include patient history, clinical data and tissues/xrays, etc that will be presented to the class as a means of promoting inquiry and pedagogical instruction. Data are presented as average case study grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Content in Biology</th>
<th>70% of students should score 70% or better on this question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th>90% of students scored 70% or better.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: Analysis of graphical data (O: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student in BIOL2107 interpreted graphs to come up with logical conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Scientific Inquiry</th>
<th>80% of students will perform 75% or better.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
<th>79% of students scored 80% or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Scientific Communication</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
80% of students will perform 75% or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

79% of students scored 80% or higher.

**Target for O5: Critical thinking**

80% of students will perform 75% or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

79% of students scored 80% or higher.

**M 25: Oral Communication (O: 2, 4)**

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

**Target for O2: Scientific Communication**

80% of students will score 80% or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

86% of students scored 80% or higher

**Target for O4: Content in Biology**

80% of students will score 80% or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

86% of students scored 80% or higher

**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:** Finished
- **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
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Analysis of data | **Outcome/Objective:** Scientific Inquiry
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty teaching introductory courses and the gateway course, along with laboratory coordinators

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

Students are given different sets of hypothetical data and are 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
**CTW in Cell and Molecular Biology**

An additional hour has been amended to the current Cell & Molecular Biology Lab to allow Faculty to mentor students through the interpretation and communication of their experiments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

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

- Measure: Ability to apply chemistry to biological problems | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Analysis of primary literature | Outcome/Objective: History, Nature and Impact of Biology
- Measure: Deliver presentations with written abstracts | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
- Measure: Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminologies | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Interpretation of Graphical Information | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
- Measure: Logical Hypothesis formulation | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
- Measure: Oral Communication | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Critical analysis of primary literature | Outcome/Objective: History, Nature and Impact of Biology
- Measure: Analysis of graphical data | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
- Measure: Conduct investigations | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Content: Molecular Processes | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Writing Lab Reports | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
- Measure: Use computers for data analysis, literature search | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
- Measure: Use Supplemental Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Working productively as a group | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking
- Measure: Writing about molecular processes | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology
- Measure: Writing Lab Reports | Outcome/Objective: Content in Biology

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Therese Poole, Frank Cruz

**Additional Resources:** One additional instructor
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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, 76 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 41 (54%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 36 (87%) received an “excellent” ranking, 5 (17%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and none (0%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 35 students, 3 withdrew from the course, and the remaining 32 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp08 term, 14 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 55 (76%) had completed the course, with 42 (76%) rated “excellent,” 10 (18%) rated “satisfactory” and 3 (5%) rated “unsatisfactory.” (Values do not take into account the fact that Incompletes received in the Spring 08 term have the current semester to make them up). Therefore, 95% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 28% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (68%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%. [Note: of the 70 students who completed the degree in 2007-2008, 22 (31%) initially received in “Incomplete” grade, which was subsequently completed with an “excellent” (68%) or a “satisfactory” (32%) rating. Six (8.6%) of these students had completed all other requirements the semester they enrolled in Biol 8888; thus, their graduation was delayed by one semester specifically in order to make up the Incomplete they received in this class.]

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, 76 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 41 (54%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 36 (87%) received an “excellent” ranking, 5 (17%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and none (0%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 35 students, 3 withdrew from the course, and the remaining 32 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp08 term, 14 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 55 (76%) had completed the course, with 42 (76%) rated “excellent,” 10 (18%) rated “satisfactory” and 3 (5%) rated “unsatisfactory.” (Values do not take into account the fact that Incompletes received in the Spring 08 term have the current semester to make them up). Therefore, 95% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 28% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (68%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%. [Note: of the 70 students who completed the degree in 2007-2008, 22 (31%) initially received in “Incomplete” grade, which was subsequently completed with an “excellent” (68%) or a “satisfactory” (32%) rating. Six (8.6%) of these students had completed all other requirements the semester they enrolled in Biol 8888; thus, their graduation was delayed by one semester specifically in order to make up the Incomplete they received in this class.]

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, 76 students enrolled in the Biol 8888 capstone course, with 41 (54%) completing the course requirements by the end of the semester in which they were enrolled. Of these, 36 (87%) received an “excellent” ranking, 5 (17%) received a “satisfactory” ranking, and none (0%) received an “unsatisfactory” ranking. Of the remaining 35 students, 3 withdrew from the course, and the remaining 32 received grades of Incomplete. By the end of the Sp08 term, 14 of these had completed the course requirements, yielding the following revised totals: 55 (76%) had completed the course, with 42 (76%) rated “excellent,” 10 (18%) rated “satisfactory” and 3 (5%) rated “unsatisfactory.” (Values do not take into account the fact that Incompletes received in the Spring 08 term have the current semester to make them up). Therefore, 95% of those who completed their requirements have made satisfactory progress; however, because 28% of the students’ results are still pending, the current overall success level (68%) falls short of the target performance goal of 80%. [Note: of the 70 students who completed the degree in 2007-2008, 22 (31%) initially received in “Incomplete” grade, which was subsequently completed with an “excellent” (68%) or a “satisfactory” (32%) rating. Six (8.6%) of these students had completed all other requirements the semester they enrolled in Biol 8888; thus, their graduation was delayed by one semester specifically in order to make up the Incomplete they received in this class.]

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46(66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.]

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46(66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.]

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46(66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree 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:** Finished
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Revision of Non-thesis MS course.
Non-thesis M.S. students are opting to take an Incomplete in the Biol 8888 capstone course, and this has the potential to delay their graduation. Currently the course syllabus has a suggested time line but no defined deadlines for student-initiated actions such as forming a faculty committee, completing a rough draft, or submitting corrected copies to their committee members. The revised syllabus will set up required deadlines for these actions, points toward the final grade being assigned for meeting the deadlines.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Non-thesis Report</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Content</td>
<td>Scientific Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Time for completion of MS degree</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Content</td>
<td>Scientific Inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Director of the M.S. program (W.W. Walthall)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The target performance goal for completion of degree requirements continues to be met, with 86% of students receiving the M.S. degree within three years of joining the program. This value is unchanged from the previous year; however, there is an increase of approximately 10% this year in the total number of graduates (70 vs. 64). The time to degree is lengthened to a certain extent by the inclusion of doctoral students who complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements while pursuing the doctorate. Of the 9 Ph.D. students who took advantage of this option in 2007-2008, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. If data are considered only for the 61 of the 70 M.S. recipients who were enrolled solely as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The high number of students who do not complete their non-thesis capstone paper within one semester continues to pose a problem. Of the 70 students who completed the degree in 2007-2008, 22 (31% of the total) initially received an “Incomplete” grade in the Biol 8888 capstone course. In all cases, these students subsequently completed the course requirements, receiving either an “excellent” (68%) or a “satisfactory” (32%) rating. Six (8.6%) of these students had completed all other requirements the semester they enrolled in Biol 8888, however, and thus their graduation was delayed by one semester specifically in order to make up the Incomplete they received in this class. Although this is not a high percentage of students, the delay they experience should be addressed. Therefore, steps will be taken to improve the efficiency of the capstone process (see action plan).

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Biology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Biology Department is firmly committed to the dual goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University’s Strategic Plan. The mission of the Biology Department is: a) to provide students with the basic core of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow; b) to increase the understanding of biological processes through cutting edge research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and c) to work with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1) form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; 2) comprehend the current scientific literature; 3) place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and 4) develop an understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Twenty-four students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.48 years, while the median time was 6.3 years. Fourteen of the 24 students (58%) 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Twenty-four students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.48 years, while the median time was 6.3 years. Fourteen of the 24 students (58%) 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Twenty-four students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.48 years, while the median time was 6.3 years. Fourteen of the 24 students (58%) 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 13 (76%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 13 (76%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program.

Target for O3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 13 (76%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program.

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

Evaluation of Revised Doctoral Examination Format
During the 2007-2008 academic year, the format for the Ph.D. examination was modified in a way that decreases the complexity of the proposal-based format and limits faculty input into the process. Compared with the 2006-2007 year, this year a lower percentage of students passed the exam on the first attempt. This may be due to the need for both students and faculty to adjust to the new format. The Department has decided to use the new format for another year and, should the trend toward low pass percentages continue, re-evaluate the exam format at that time.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Ph.D. Qualifying Examination | Outcome/Objective: 3. Scientific Content
  | Scientific Communication | Scientific Inquiry

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. graduate directors (Drs. G. Pierce, C.-D. Liu, and C. Jiang).

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We continue to meet our goal of obtaining a 50% completion rate within 6.5 years

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The percentage of students who passed the Ph.D. qualifying examination dipped below the goals set by the department during 2007-2008. This may reflect the fact that this year certain changes were made to the format for the Ph.D. examination. Specifically, students were no longer required to prepare a full NIH-style proposal with multiple specific aims. Instead, they were required to propose a single specific aim and defend it orally. Faculty committee input was also decreased: faculty were limited to providing one set of comments for the pre-proposal and one for the rough draft of the final proposal. The relatively low percentage of students who passed this year may be due to 1) a statistical anomaly, 2) the need for students and faculty alike to adjust to the new examination format, or 3) a defect in the examination process that must be addressed. The pass rates will be monitored closely next year and, based on the results, modifications may need to be made in the exam format.
## Mission / Purpose

The Master of Science degree is designed for students who wish to work as Business Analysis practitioners. A typical student would have an undergraduate business degree, strong functional experience, or exceptional interest in Business Analysis. The program blends the elements of the Business Analysis (problem solving, information technology and analytical methods) so that every graduate will have a foundation in the Business Analysis discipline. The emphasis is on a deeper understanding of the concepts and techniques used. Students will gain expertise in the following areas: •Business Intelligence and Decision Support Systems •Multivariate Statistical Analysis Methods and Data Mining •Problem Solving and Risk Analysis Graduates of the program will ideally enter a career path requiring analysis and decision support in any functional area of business, or across functional areas.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation

Students should be able to qualitatively state the key issues clearly and accurately the issues in a business problem.

### SLO 2: Software Skills (M: 4)

Students can clearly interpret results, and present recommendations and supporting arguments cogently for purposes of business decision making.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Interpretation of results, Ability to translate. (M: 4, 5)

Students can clearly interpret results, and present recommendations and supporting arguments cogently for purposes of business decision making.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Qualitative Analysis of a Business Situation (M: 1, 5)

Students are able to state the key issues clearly and accurately recommendations for decision making.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Model Building Ability (M: 2, 4)

Student models are developed to accurately represent the situation, and neatly presented.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience
SLO 6: Understanding of Techniques (M: 3, 4)

Students clearly understand the mathematical techniques used, and can apply them appropriately.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking  
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualitative Analysis Skills (O: 4)

Instructors will rate students’ ability to state a situation’s key issues clearly and accurately on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O4: Qualitative Analysis of a Business Situation

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 2007-2008 - Target:

18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.61.

M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 5)

Instructors will rate students’ ability to develop and accurately represent the situation presented with a model on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O5: Model Building Ability

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 2007-2008 - Target:

18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.55.

M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 6)

Instructors will rate students’ ability to clearly understand the mathematical techniques used and apply them appropriately on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O6: Understanding of Techniques

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 2007-2008 - Target:

18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.44.

M 4: Software Skills (O: 2, 3, 5, 6)

Instructors will rate students’ ability to manipulate applicable software packages, going beyond what was demonstrated in the classroom on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O2: Software 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 2007-2008 - Target:

18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.38.

Target for O3: Interpretation of results, Ability to translate.

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 2007-2008 - Target:
18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.38.

### Target for O5: Model Building Ability
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 2007-2008 - Target:
18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.38.

### Target for O6: Understanding of Techniques
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 2007-2008 - Target:
18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.38.

### M 5: Interpretation and Translation (O: 3, 4)
Instructors will rate students' ability to clearly interpret results and cogently present recommendations and supporting arguments on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

### Target for O3: Interpretation of results, Ability to translate.
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 2007-2008 - Target:
18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.72.

### Target for O4: Qualitative Analysis of a Business Situation
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 2007-2008 - Target:
18 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.72.

### 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
- **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
- **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
**Software Acquisition**
Find sources of affordable software for students to practice advanced analytical techniques.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 Chemistry Assessment of Core**  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose
Generally two groups of students take chemistry in the core. The first group are students who major in a science such as chemistry, biology, physics or students who wish to go to professional school. These students take the General Chemistry sequence (1211K and 1212K). The goal for these students is to provide them with a necessary background to succeed in the courses in the major and for preparation for the entrance exams for professional school. The second group of students are Allied Health/non-science students. These students take the 1151 1152 sequence which presents a broad overview of general chemistry, biochemistry and organic chemistry.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking in chemistry (M: 1)**
Students will be able to use critical thinking skills to answer questions about chemistry.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Analysis of selected ACS questions (O: 1)
For each of the exit exams the faculty have chosen a number of questions which represent higher order critical thinking skills.

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking in chemistry**
The minimum requirement was 2 correct out of seven questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Expected Performance</th>
<th>Actual Class performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 1151 Raw Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>Actual Class performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 1152 Raw Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>Actual Class performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 1211 Raw Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Actual Class performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 1212 Raw Score</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Actual Class performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Continued emphasis on critical thinking skills**
Faculty who teach in the core will continue to emphasize critical thinking skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Analysis of selected ACS questions | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in chemistry

**Responsible Person/Group:** Doyle Barrow

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on...
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Mission / Purpose
The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with development of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. The program currently has 263 B.S. students and last year, 29 B.S. degrees were awarded.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: 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
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: 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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Critical Thinking in Chemistry (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each graduate will develop critical thinking skills as relates to Chemistry. 2a Each student will develop high order problem solving skills. 2b Each graduate will be able to ask pertinent questions and develop logical experimental procedures to answer these questions. 2c Each graduate will learn to interpret original data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understanding current Issues in chemistry (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society. 2e. Understand safety and waste control - impact on society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Oral and Written Communication Skills (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each graduate shall develop oral and written communication skills. The written communication skills will be evidenced by 1a and/or 1b. The oral communication skills will be evidenced by 1c and/or 1d. 1a At least six reports based on laboratory experiments which will comply with current American Chemical Society guidelines. 1b A term paper, grant proposal, literature review or research paper on a current topic in chemistry. 1c An oral examination or an oral presentation in class. 1d Presentation of a poster or oral talk at a Georgia State, local, regional or national meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Current Laboratory Practices (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every graduate will demonstrate proficiency in some or all of the following laboratory skills. 1f. Keeping of a quality record (laboratory notebook) of experiments. 2f. Demonstrate proper understanding of laboratory waste management. 3f. Demonstrate proper laboratory technique (i.e., obtaining mass, transferring volumes, etc.) 4f. Demonstrate proficiency in one or more of the following: IR spectroscopy, NMR spectroscopy, UV-vis spectroscopy, chromatographic techniques, electrophoresis, titrations, organic and/or inorganic synthesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</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>
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Laboratory Reports (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

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 O 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 sections 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: Technology

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Laboratory report results were based on the following rubric. Communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking are all evaluated on the following scale 1- unacceptable, 2- poor, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent and 6 outstanding. Reports fall into two categories lower division which includes the general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry laboratories and the upper division which includes the analytical labs and senior research. In the lower division laboratories the average scores are listed below. Communication 3.4 Technology 4.2 Contemporary issues 3.5 Critical thinking 4.7 The upper division laboratory reports were evaluated as follows Communication 4.6 Technology 5.1 Contemporary issues 3.4 Critical thinking 4.2

#### Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Chemistry

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Laboratory report results were based on the following rubric. Communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking are all evaluated on the following scale 1- unacceptable, 2- poor, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent and 6 outstanding. Reports fall into two categories lower division which includes the general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry laboratories and the upper division which includes the analytical labs and senior research. In the lower division laboratories the average scores are listed below. Communication 3.4 Technology 4.2 Contemporary issues 3.5 Critical thinking 4.7 The upper division laboratory reports were evaluated as follows Communication 4.6 Technology 5.1 Contemporary issues 3.4 Critical thinking 4.2

#### Target for O4: Understanding current Issues in chemistry

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Laboratory report results were based on the following rubric. Communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking are all evaluated on the following scale 1- unacceptable, 2- poor, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent and 6 outstanding. Reports fall into two categories lower division which includes the general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry laboratories and the upper division which includes the analytical labs and senior research. In the lower division laboratories the average scores are listed below. Communication 3.4 Technology 4.2 Contemporary issues 3.5 Critical thinking 4.7 The upper division laboratory reports were evaluated as follows Communication 4.6 Technology 5.1 Contemporary issues 3.4 Critical thinking 4.2

#### Target for O5: Oral and Written Communication Skills

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Laboratory report results were based on the following rubric. Communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking are all evaluated on the following scale 1- unacceptable, 2- poor, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent and 6 outstanding. Reports fall into two categories lower division which includes the general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry laboratories and the upper division which includes the analytical labs and senior research. In the lower division laboratories the average scores are listed below. Communication 3.4 Technology 4.2 Contemporary issues 3.5 Critical thinking 4.7 The upper division laboratory reports were evaluated as follows Communication 4.6 Technology 5.1 Contemporary issues 3.4 Critical thinking 4.2

#### Target for O6: Current Laboratory Practices

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Laboratory report results were based on the following rubric. Communication, technology, contemporary issues and critical thinking are all evaluated on the following scale 1- unacceptable, 2- poor, 3 - good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent and 6 outstanding. Reports fall into two categories lower division which includes the general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry laboratories and the upper division which includes the analytical labs and senior research. In the lower division laboratories the average scores are listed below. Communication 3.4 Technology 4.2 Contemporary issues 3.5 Critical thinking 4.7 The upper division laboratory reports were evaluated as follows Communication 4.6 Technology 5.1 Contemporary issues 3.4 Critical thinking 4.2
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 O2: Quantitative skills

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The American Chemical Society exit exams were given for all available courses. Below is a list of the ACS scores for all sections. Course Percentile 1050 - 65.2 1151 77.7 1152 66.2 1211 50.2 1212 50.3 3410 63.0 4110 72.7 4120 48.0

### Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Chemistry

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The American Chemical Society exit exams were given for all available courses. Below is a list of the ACS scores for all sections. Course Percentile 1050 - 65.2 1151 77.7 1152 66.2 1211 50.2 1212 50.3 3410 63.0 4110 72.7 4120 48.0

### Target for O4: Understanding current Issues in chemistry

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The American Chemical Society exit exams were given for all available courses. Below is a list of the ACS scores for all sections. Course Percentile 1050 - 65.2 1151 77.7 1152 66.2 1211 50.2 1212 50.3 3410 63.0 4110 72.7 4120 48.0

### 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: Technology

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

6 of the 16 courses did not meet the student perceptions minimum.

### Target for O2: Quantitative skills

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

6 of the 16 courses did not meet the student perceptions minimum.

### Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Chemistry

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

6 of the 16 courses did not meet the student perceptions minimum.

### Target for O4: Understanding current Issues in chemistry

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

6 of the 16 courses did not meet the student perceptions minimum.

### Target for O5: Oral and Written Communication Skills

Retention 3-yr retention departmental goal 60% Student perceptions - Core courses 4.0 or better Upper level 4.3 or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

6 of the 16 courses did not meet the student perceptions minimum.
**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
  - **Measure:** Miscellaneous assessments | **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:** Quantitative skills
  - **Measure:** Miscellaneous assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** 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:** Quantitative skills
  - **Measure:** Miscellaneous assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** 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

**Additional Resources:** Funding has been provided by the office of the Provost.
Continued Emphasis in Freshman area
Efforts in the 1211 and 1212 courses have paid off over the past two years. We plan on expanding our efforts into the 1151 and 1152 courses with new tutorials and faculty support.

Decrease the DFW rate in the Organic Sequence
The organic sequence DWF rate has been high for several years. The faculty are in the process of trying to determine why this course continues to be at risk course. Much of the discussion is about the background knowledge of transfer students. We will try new tutorials for the 2nd organic course which will concentrate on the background material.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Although there has been much improvement in the freshman area the department still feels that there needs to be continued emphasis on this area. We will increase goals this year to 53 percentile on the ACS in this area. The upper division courses seem to be on track with good results in all but one of these courses.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Organic Lecture is still the biggest at risk course in the department.
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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..
syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of association with the ACS is the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: 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

**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

**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

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
80% pass

**Target for O3: Technology**
80% pass

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
80% pass

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
80% pass

**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.
Target for O2: critical thinking
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

Target for O3: Technology
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

Target for O4: Quantitative skills
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
90% successfully defend a thesis or write an acceptable research paper

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

**Continued Quality and Growth**
The masters plan meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: general exam | Outcome/Objective: Comunication
- Measure: thesis/paper | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: critical thinking | Outcome/Objective: Quantitative skills | Technology

**Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D. (Graduate Director) Donald Hamelberg, Ph.D.

**Continued Quality and Growth**
The M.S. program meets departmental standards.

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

**Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D. (Graduate Director) Donald Hamelberg, Ph.D.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2007-2008 Chemistry PhD**
(As of: 12/13/2016 03:12 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 devolopment of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. 57
# Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

## SLO 1: Communication Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms. 2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content 3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology 5. Work effectively in group situations. 6. Students must perform and analyze and be able to relate experiments which address a current problem in the chemical sciences.

Relevant Associations: The undergraduate program is ACS certified and the same writing style is used in all graduate programs.

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

## SLO 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry 4. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 5. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5.

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

## SLO 3: Technology (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use computer graphics 2. Access chemical databases 3. Access chemical literature. 4. Conduct molecular modeling of chemical structures 5. Use normal word processing skills. 6. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve novel problems in chemistry.

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

## SLO 4: Quantitative Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use mathematical skills from algebra, trigonometry and calculus to solve problems and understand theory in chemistry. 2. Understand error analysis to validate experimental results. 3. Translate problem situations into symbolic representations for the purpose of solving problems.

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

## SLO 5: Contemporary Issues (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society. 2. Understand safety and waste control - impact on society. 3. Students must perform and analyze experiments which address a current problem in the chemical sciences.

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### 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.
Target for O1: Communication Skills
90% pass

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
90% pass

Target for O3: Technology
90% pass

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
90% pass

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
90% pass

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. Organic chemistry, biochemistry, physical chemistry. The exam is graded by the faculty on a pass-fail basis. Once the written exam is complete a committee is formed consisting of two faculty members from the student`s major and 1 from outside the major. The student gives a brief presentation of research and the committee asks questions which may be general in nature or related to the student`s research.

Target for O1: Communication Skills
80% pass

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
80% pass

Target for O3: Technology
80% pass

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
80% pass

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
80% pass

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

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
95% pass

Target for O3: Technology
95% pass

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills
95% pass

Target for O5: Contemporary Issues
95% pass

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
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: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

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: Oral Communication in the core (M: 1)

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

2 Oral Communication

Institutional Priority Associations

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: online and in class assessments in Speech 1000 (O: 1)

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.

Target for O1: Oral Communication in the core

Improvement over 2006-2007 scores

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 1022 students in fall 2007 and 769 students in spring 2008. The eight performance competencies measured correspond to a universal grading form...
used in all Speech 1000 sections. Each performance competency was measured on a three-point scale, with 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, and 3 = outstanding. The Competent Speaker scores range higher than one might intuitively expect due to the way in which the speech assignment operates within the Speech 1000 curriculum. Students are only provided a single opportunity to hone their public speaking skills; and instructors' evaluations often reflect an acknowledgement of the assignment's limited ability to improve the performance competencies targeted. Generally speaking, however, we might conclude that the assignment does improve oral competency among GSU undergraduates and reduce speech apprehension to some degree. Collecting more exhaustive data and examining more diverse relationships between variables (see Recommendations for 2008-2009 Assessment) should generate a more nuanced assessment of the Speech 1000 course and its development of oral competency skills. In fall 2007 and spring 2008, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA-24 measure, producing 1022 scores in fall 2007 and 769 scores in spring 2008. As indicated in the four tables above, the overall mean score showed a slight decrease in students' communication apprehension: from 60.58023 to 58.08317 in fall 2007; and from 60.28739 to 59.09493 in spring 2008. More specifically, these sections demonstrated a slight decrease in apprehension for the public communication scale: dropping from 18.10176 to 17.30626 in fall 2007; and from 18.09623 to 17.329 in spring 2008. The PRCA-24 measurement also showed a statistically smaller, but notable decrease in student communication apprehension in group, meeting and dyad situations. The results from the assessment measure indicate stronger support for the hypothesis that Speech 1000 strengthens students' oral communication competencies by enhancing their ability to communicate in a variety of communicative situations. In fall 2007 and spring 2008, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 1022 scores in fall 2007 and 769 scores in spring 2008. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2007 mean score indicated a small overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 193.8268 pre-test to 200.3226 post-test. In fall 2007, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased from (23.24013 to 23.76608 and from 56.41734 to 60.00034 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2007, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2008 results showed a slight decrease in the willingness to communicate measure, from 225.4862 in the pre-test to 199.2103 in the post-test. Compared to the fall 2007 measure and previous measures taken in Speech 1000, these results are idiosyncratic, but may be explained by a variety of interpretations: the introduction of new instructors during the spring 2008 semester or students taking the survey less seriously in the online version. Regardless of the reason, these results suggest a need for closer examination of future measurements.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Competent Speaker: Discussion Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 1022 students in fall 2007 and 769 students in spring 2008. The eight performance competencies measured correspond to a universal grading form used in all Speech 1000 sections. Each performance competency was measured on a three-point scale, with 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, and 3 = outstanding. The Competent Speaker scores range higher than one might intuitively expect due to the way in which the speech assignment operates within the Speech 1000 curriculum. Students are only provided a single opportunity to hone their public speaking skills; and instructors' evaluations often reflect an acknowledgement of the assignment's limited ability to improve the performance competencies targeted. Generally speaking, however, we might conclude that the assignment does improve oral competency among GSU undergraduates and reduce speech apprehension to some degree. Collecting more exhaustive data and examining more diverse relationships between variables (see Recommendations for 2008-2009 Assessment) should generate a more nuanced assessment of the Speech 1000 course and its development of oral competency skills. In fall 2007 and spring 2008, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA-24 measure, producing 1022 scores in fall 2007 and 769 scores in spring 2008. As indicated in the four tables above, the overall mean score showed a slight decrease in students' communication apprehension: from 60.58023 to 58.08317 in fall 2007; and from 60.28739 to 59.09493 in spring 2008. More specifically, these sections demonstrated a slight decrease in apprehension for the public communication scale: dropping from 18.10176 to 17.30626 in fall 2007; and from 18.09623 to 17.329 in spring 2008. The PRCA-24 measurement also showed a statistically smaller, but notable decrease in student communication apprehension in group, meeting and dyad situations. The results from the assessment measure indicate stronger support for the hypothesis that Speech 1000 strengthens students' oral competency by enhancing their confidence in a variety of communication situations.

Willingness to Communicate: Discussion In fall 2007 and spring 2008, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 1022 scores in fall 2007 and 769 scores in spring 2008. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2007 mean score indicated a small overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations,
from 193.8268 pre-test to 200.3226 post-test. In fall 2007, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 23.24013 to 23.76608 and from 56.41734 to 60.00034 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2007, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2008 results showed a slight decrease in the willingness to communicate measure, from 225.4862 in the pre-test to 199.2103 in the post-test. Compared to the fall 2007 measure and previous measures taken in Speech 1000, these results are idiosyncratic, but may be explained by a variety of interpretations: the introduction of new instructors during the spring 2008 semester or students taking the survey less seriously in the online version. Regardless of the reason, these results suggest a need for closer examination of future measurements.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Communication Disorders MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 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 2007-08 academic year there were 49 students enrolled in the program and 12 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.

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.

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.

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.

O/O 5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues (M: 1, 8, 15)
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.

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.

O/O 6: Outline Professional Credentials (M: 16)
The student can outline the requirements for state and national certification, specialty recognition, and licensure.

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.
**O/O 7: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills (M: 17)**
The student demonstrates oral and written communication skills appropriate to professional 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.

**O/O 8: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment (M: 18)**
The student accurately assesses clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders using formal and informal assessment procedures (including screening, prevention, and evaluation).
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.

**O/O 9: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention (M: 19)**
The student develops and implements intervention programs that are functional, logical in sequence, and effective in changing client behavior.
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.

**O/O 10: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities (M: 20)**
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.
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.

**O/O 11: Apply Technology (M: 1, 6, 7, 21)**
The student uses appropriate technology for clinical assessment and intervention and for professional productivity.
Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

**O/O 12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (M: 1, 9)**
The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and disorders.
Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

**O/O 13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11)**
The student can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of speech, language, hearing, and communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders including their etiologies, characteristics, anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.
Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

**O/O 14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes (M: 1, 2, 10)**
The student can describe normal communication and swallowing processes and behaviors including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.
Relevant Associations: Council for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology; NCATE; PSC; Georgia Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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**
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O3: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O11: Apply Technology
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O12: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eleven out of our 12 graduates (92%) passed the Praxis II exam on the first attempt with an average score of 706. The one graduate who did not pass retook the exam and passed on her second attempt.

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
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
91% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (27% scored above).

Target for O14: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
91% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (27% scored above).

**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**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (45% scored above).

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (45% scored above).

**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**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
91% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (9% scored above).

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
91% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (9% scored above).

**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**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
82% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (36% scored above).

**Target for O13: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
82% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (36% scored above).

**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 70% or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The overall program performance score for this area is 75%.

**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 70% or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The overall program performance score for this area is 75%.

**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 70% or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The overall program performance score for this area is 75%.

### M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemnt) (O: 2, 11)

Score for Category VI Clinical Management

**Target for O2: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (27% scored above).

**Target for O11: Apply Technology**

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (27% scored above).

### 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**

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (9% scored above).

**Target for O4: Evaluate Research Relevance**

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (9% scored above).

**Target for O5: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students scored within the national average performance range or above (9% scored above).

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.7.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.3.

### 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...
**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.7.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.3.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.5.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.8.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.3

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.7.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.8.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.6.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.9.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average rating for this section of the portfolio is 3.4.

**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
Curriculum review.
The CD faculty will continue its on-going review of courses and course content with particular focus on neurogenic disorders during the 2008-09 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
- Measure: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Provide for additional discussion of portfolio.
Some students appear to be having difficulty documenting their learning in one section of the portfolio (Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues) and may benefit from additional discussion of appropriate artifacts for that section. These discussions will take place in EXC 7590, EXC 7630 and in other classes that may have assignments appropriate to the learning outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: All CD faculty members.

Review measures - Learning Outcomes 9, 10, 11, 12
The CD faculty have raised the question whether the Portfolio is the best measure of our students’ communication skills, assessment skills, intervention skills, and interpersonal qualities (Learning Outcomes #9, 10, 11, and 12). The faculty will meet to discuss this issue and determine the best measurement tool(s) for these outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio Section 9 (Comm Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
- Measure: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills Interven) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
- Measure: Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Review measures used for Learning Outcome 5.
The CD faculty have raised the question whether the Praxis Exam is the best measure of our students’ ability to discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct (Learning Outcome #5). The faculty will meet to discuss this issue and determine the best measurement tool(s) for this outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II Exam (Total Score) | Outcome/Objective: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
For the 2007-08 assessment cycle the CD faculty made some revisions in the Target Levels for the measures we use to determine achievement of student learning outcomes. These changes were needed due to the types of scores obtained on the various measures. The program now uses percentages of students achieving certain scores on the Praxis II exam and its subtests and average scores for program portfolio sections. These items are all linked to our program's student learning outcomes. In the 2006-07 assessment cycle the CD Program identified several areas for improvement. The first of these was helping students select appropriate artifacts and write reflections for their program portfolios that document their achievement of student learning outcomes. During the 2007-08 academic year additional information was added to the Student Handbook and CD faculty provided additional opportunities for portfolio discussion in classes. The full impact of these actions will not be known for another year or two (the master's degree program takes 2-3 years to complete); however, student performance on the portfolio has improved during 2007-08. All students successfully completed their program portfolios and met the target level for all sections of the portfolio except one (Section 7 Professional Issues). In addition the CD faculty continued work on a comprehensive curriculum review during the 2007-08 academic year and identified several topics that needed expanded coverage in class and/or in clinical experiences. Those changes have been implemented in several classes. We anticipate that these changes will be reflected in future Praxis exam scores; however, in the current assessment cycle the target levels were met for the total Praxis II exam performance and performance on all subtests.
except one (Neurogenic Disorders).

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

Students are improving their performance in all sections of their portfolios except one, Section 7 Professional Issues. This has been targeted for improvement with an action plan. Students are performing well on the Praxis II exam, scoring on average 100 points above the passing score of 600. Their performance on all subtests except one (Neurogenic Disorders) meets our program's target. This area is also addressed in an action plan.
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<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 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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Understand research methods (M: 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 articulately engage the questions of the committee members. Proposals for creative projects in film/video should go beyond the technical-logistical, and should present in detail the aesthetic sources and traditions out of which the student’s work is operating. |
| Relevant Associations: NCA |
| **Institutional Priority Associations** |
| 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| **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** |
| 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| **Strategic Plan Associations** |
| 6.3 Graduate Experience |

| **SLO 4: Command of scholarly and creative work in area (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** |
| 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
### 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**

Score of 80 to 100% on final theory papers

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All of the 22 students who took the course scored 80% or better on their final papers, with 100% success.

#### 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)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The graduate committee must still work out the assessment procedure for thesis quality.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

13 out of 14 students scored higher than 80% on their final projects. 9 A grades, 4 B grades, and 1 C grade. Our success rate was 93%.

#### M 4: Research Theses (O: 1)

Successfully defended MA research theses

**Target for O1: Understand research methods**

100% success in thesis defenses

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The department successfully graduated 15 MA students last year and no defense was unsuccessful.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The graduate committee is still working to construct a workable plan for assessing the quality of the wide range of thesis projects developed in the department.

### 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 strengthen. By expanding orientation, we are able to stress the fact that all students must have thesis advisors by their seventh course. This move has significantly improved the quality of theses in the department, and some of our MA graduates are now being placed in top-ranked doctoral programs. The film/video program has a much clearer shape now with the addition of new courses. Our pre-Ph.D. MA students consistently present conference papers now in their second year of the program, and some have begun to publish. Overall, the quality of our graduate students remains very good, and the graduate culture promotes competitive learning.

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

The most pressing challenge facing the graduate program is recruitment suitable to our stature. Our research faculty are now highly visible on the national scene, and yet the quality of our applications has remained flat. Given the rapid growth of our faculty (6 tenure track hires last year alone), aggressive and successful recruitment of new graduate students is our number one concern. As
noted above, we also still need to work more carefully to provide a workable method for reporting on the quality of thesis defenses across the board, and we also need to clarify what we mean by methods in a department where almost one-third of the faculty are critical scholars. Because of this period of rapid growth, we still are in long-term discussions related to a possible MFA degree, and a possible non-thesis applied communication track, though the latter has been put on hold until this hiring season is over.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Communication Studies PhD**

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Graduate Program in Communication offers its students a multi-disciplinary curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree. The program is designed to prepare students for research and teaching in one of two primary areas of emphasis: public communication and moving images studies. The curriculum is designed to provide students with in depth training in communication pedagogy and the professional expectations of the discipline, as well as mentored experiences in both teaching and research.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Research proficiency (M: 1, 4)

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).

Relevant Associations: NCA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience
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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 1, 3, 4)

After approval by the advisory committee of the reading lists in four areas related to the student=s research project (including one theoretical area), the members of the advisory committee draft questions which the student answers in writing, in four-hour sessions per area. Committee members grade each area of the exam as High pass, Pass, Low pass, or Fail; and make a detailed list of questions based on the student=s written responses. Assuming the student has not failed more than one area, an oral defense is arranged, in which the student is expected not only to clarify and expand upon the responses written, but also to range across the entire reading lists in answering questions posed. Upon successful completion of the oral defense, one grade is assigned to the entire exam.

Target for O1: Research proficiency

All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All Ph.D. students who took comprehensive exams passed them in the last academic year, and two students achieved "high pass."

Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory

All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All Ph.D. students who took comprehensive exams passed them in the last academic year, and two students achieved "high pass."

Target for O4: Oral and written communication competency

All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, and most should pass on the first attempt.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All Ph.D. students who took comprehensive exams passed them in the last academic year, and two students achieved "high pass."

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Of the 31 student teachers in our department, 25 of them received a score of 4.0 or better on question 17 (or just above 80%). 18 of 31 had grade distributions within or below our target range (or just above 58%). Only four students had very high averages (e.g. 3.5), and they were counseled during their annual reviews with the Chair and Graduate Director. Overall our teaching in the department is excellent. The average of all responses to question #17 was 4.31, and the average grade distribution across all sections was just above 3.06. Again, all students have their teaching reviewed during their annual reviews, and students who have problems are put on probation and provided with teaching advice, monitoring, etc. Given the overall high quality of our teaching and our methods for reviewing teaching, no further action in this area is needed at this time.

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.
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 serve as respondents, and having other faculty in attendance at the in-house conference, allows us to identify any students who need extra work on their argumentation and presentation skills. We also used a satisfaction survey to learn about student opinion related to the event, and the response was overwhelmingly positive. Our students continue to improve in this area, and several faculty have instituted debate formats in their seminars to provide students with even more opportunities to present structured public arguments.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The conference was a solid success, and the overall quality of student presentation continues to improve. Having faculty serve as respondents, and having other faculty in attendance at the in-house conference, allows us to identify any students who need extra work on their argumentation and presentation skills. We also used a satisfaction survey to learn about student opinion related to the event, and the response was overwhelmingly positive. Our students continue to improve in this area, and several faculty have instituted debate formats in their seminars to provide students with even more opportunities to present structured public arguments.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The conference was a solid success, and the overall quality of student presentation continues to improve. Having faculty serve as respondents, and having other faculty in attendance at the in-house conference, allows us to identify any students who need extra work on their argumentation and presentation skills. We also used a satisfaction survey to learn about student opinion related to the event, and the response was overwhelmingly positive. Our students continue to improve in this area, and several faculty have instituted debate formats in their seminars to provide students with even more opportunities to present structured public arguments.

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In the last academic year our students presented fifty one conference presentations (not including our in-house conference), and they published three book reviews, four journal articles, two book chapters, and one book. Five journal articles or book chapters are currently in press, and an additional book is under contract. Overall this indicates that our students are becoming increasingly productive. We have approximately 50 doctoral students, so excluding first year students we are just on target, though as the program matures we would like to see the number of publications steadily increase over the next several years. While the number of publications is slightly down from last year, the number of conference papers is decidedly up. We went from 14 to 10 publications, but we went from 32 to 51 conference papers, suggesting that publication rates should remain strong (especially given our implementation of annual reviews for professional development).

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the faculty who reported their grades, 106 out of 153 doctoral students received 90% or better on their final paper, or just over 69%. We fell short of our goal, therefore, by 6%. Many faculty were quick to also indicate their final grades, which suggests that the overall score above 90 may be a better indicator of overall student performance. Well over 75% of our students received a grade of A or A-. Still, since final papers of course lead to conference papers and publications, if those products fall below the A level it is cause for concern. We should monitor how the number fluctuates over the next few years to ensure there is no downward trend at a time when the rigor of the program overall continues to increase.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the faculty who reported their grades, 106 out of 153 doctoral students received 90% or better on their final paper, or just over 69%. We fell short of our goal, therefore, by 6%. Many faculty were quick to also indicate their final grades, which suggests that the overall score above 90 may be a better indicator of overall student performance. Well over 75% of our students received a grade of A or A-. Still, since final papers of course lead to conference papers and publications, if those products fall below the A level it is cause for concern. We should monitor how the number fluctuates over the next few years to ensure there is no downward trend at a time when the rigor of the program overall continues to increase.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the faculty who reported their grades, 106 out of 153 doctoral students received 90% or better on their final paper, or just over 69%. We fell short of our goal, therefore, by 6%. Many faculty were quick to also indicate their final grades, which suggests that the overall score above 90 may be a better indicator of overall student performance. Well over 75% of our students received a grade of A or A-. Still, since final papers of course lead to conference papers and publications, if those products fall below the A level it is cause for concern. We should monitor how the number fluctuates over the next few years to ensure there is no downward trend at a time when the rigor of the program overall continues to increase.

**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.
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: Finished
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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations
- Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director, Graduate Faculty, Administrative Assistant for the Graduate Program

Encourage more proposals to small/boutique conf.’s
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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers
- Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: graduate faculty

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers
- Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency
- Measure: Final papers in doctoral seminars
- Outcome/Objective: Professional development competency

Implementation Description: 4/08
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate directors, graduate faculty

Improve assessment of the student conference
We may still want to consider implementing some kind of feedback form for faculty participating in the student conference. We should likely continue to gauge student satisfaction, as we did this year, related to the conference. The point is to ensure that students having trouble with argumentation and presentation skills are identified and helped by this process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty assessment of conference papers
- Outcome/Objective: Oral and written communication competency
- Measure: Publications and convention papers
- Outcome/Objective: Professional development competency

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher of the proseminar and relevant faculty

Improve reporting of defenses
We made small changes to the form regarding comprehensive examination and dissertation defenses, but more work could be done to fine tune those forms in order to more accurately assess the quality of those defenses. We did institute a procedure whereby any student who fails part of their written exams must have their committee explain in writing the procedures for remedying that failure. That written statement is kept on file with the senior administrative assistant.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Terminated
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

In 2007-2008 the number of defended dissertations was low, but the overall quality of the work of our students continues to improve. Undergraduate teaching remains excellent among our doctoral students, and we have implemented both formal and informal procedures for enhancing student teaching. More of our students are actively participating in national, regional, and “boutique” conferences, and given our implementation of annual reviews with potential probation in teaching, research assistance, professional development, and academic performance, only one student was placed on probation (indicating a very consistent level of high quality performance across the board). Regarding last year’s objectives, students have more opportunities to revise work, student satisfaction with the in-house conference was very high, and more students are attending intelligently targeted conferences.

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

We still need to work on better assessing the quality of defenses, especially those defenses that have problems. Part of the problem with earlier defenses was weak oral argumentation skills on the part of some students, but a more consistent approach to seminar formats, coupled with transformations in our professional seminars, are helping to remedy this situation. Still, more work can be done to ensure that the vast majority of doctoral seminars provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in oral argumentation. We still need to do much more to recruit high quality students to our program. This is perhaps our greatest challenge over the next several years.
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
7 Technology

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
7 Technology

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 3: CIS Enrollments (M: 12)
Information Systems (and computer science) has seen a dramatic decline in majors since 2000. The CIS department has undertaken a new curriculum to better reflect directions as well as fundation in information systems. CIS has also provided a CIS Majors’ portal to build a sense of community and to provide support to majors.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Identified User Requirements
Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 2: Specified System Requirements
Specified, analyzed, & refined the system and user requirements
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 3: Developed Architecture (O: 1)
Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
4.19

M 4: Designed programs (O: 1)
Designed the programs according to specifications
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
4.26

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
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation</th>
<th>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 2)</th>
<th>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Developed implementation plans (O: 1)</th>
<th>Developed implementation plans</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Developed Program Specifications</th>
<th>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Designed user interface (O: 1)</th>
<th>Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems design**
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 2)</th>
<th>Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O2: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 out of a 5.0 maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Enrollment in CIS BBA upper division courses (O: 3)</th>
<th>Information Systems (and computer science) has seen a dramatic decline in majors since 2000. The CIS department has undertaken a new curriculum to better reflect directions as well as fundation in information systems. CIS has also provided a CIS Majors’ portal to build a sense of community and to provide support to majors.</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Existing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O3: CIS Enrollments**
10% improvement from Fall to Fall in CIS upper division enrollments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.47% increase in CIS upperdivision enrollment from Fall 2007 (594) to Fall 2008 (1005).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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/bbacisnewcurriculum.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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008 for curriculum and Spring 2008 for CLC
Responsible Person/Group: CIS Assessment Coordinator and Associate Chair
Additional Resources: Current

Recruitment and Retention

The only unmet objective regards testing. Since many of the projects have not included testing, this seems to be a misunderstanding in the survey. The survey instructions will be clarified in this regard. While no other 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 previous program was 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/bbacisnewcurriculum.asp for additional information. The department, college, students, and the business community are excited about this evolving curriculum which they have helped form. And, the program was recently ranked 8th in the nation (up from the 10 previous rating). 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). Finally, given this change in curriculum, the CIS UPC will be tasked to consider whether the assessment instrument needs to be updated.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Enrollment in CIS BBA upper division courses | Outcome/Objective: CIS Enrollments
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC, associate chair, and assessment coordinator
Additional Resources: Adequate at this time.

Testing and Software Quality Management

Testing was the only measure that did not meet objectives. Given the importance of software quality, the CIS department defined and received approval for a new undergraduate course in software quality management. Please see Measuring and Improving Software Quality at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/syllabus/undergraduate/4300-course-outline.pdf

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Complete now.
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC and Assessment coordinator

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 (except testing) remained above the targets. Enrollment in upper division CIS courses increased over 24%.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Testing was the only measure that did not meet objectives. Given the importance of software quality, the CIS department defined and received approval for a new undergraduate course in software quality management. Please see Measuring and Improving Software Quality at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/syllabus/undergraduate/4300-course-outline.pdf.
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 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-threat 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 changes is that the landscape of the career changes is in a 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, 2006) 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.aspx) . The draft instrument was created from published course documents and then reviewed by instructional staffed 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 the student’s work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. Those 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, 2006 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 student's 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. This student should be able to analyze an organization's performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Technology

**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**

7 Technology

**SLO 3: Create environments for programs and systems (M: 4, 5, 6)**

Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
### SLO 4: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 7)
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

### SLO 5: Build and renew business via technology & process (M: 8, 9)
Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with an emerging technology. Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

### SLO 6: Communicate effectively. (M: 10)
Students should possess the ability to write memos, letters, and reports in a style appropriate to business, with contents that are clear, concise and objective oriented. Students must be able to develop and deliver effective oral presentations, including appropriate, high-impact visuals in support of key ideas. All graduates should be capable of presenting technical material to a non-technical audience.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Software Requirements Mgt Student Work (O: 1)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course and the process & business innovation course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of CIS 8030 System Specification

**Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges**
4.0

#### M 2: Business innovation requirements student work (O: 1)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8010 Process / Business Innovation

**Target for O1: Identify Business Needs and Challenges**
4.0

#### M 3: Specs Into systems 8030 student work (O: 2)
Performance on assignments in the software requirements management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8030 System Specification

**Target for O2: Translate specifications to programs & systems**
4.0

#### M 4: Network design student work (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in the network design course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8050 Network Design and Management

**Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems**
4.0

#### M 5: Database systems management student work (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in the database systems management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8040 Database Systems Management

**Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems**
4.0

#### M 6: Systems integration student work (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in the systems integration course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8020 Systems Integration

**Target for O3: Create environments for programs and systems**
4.0

#### M 7: Information systems project mgt student work (O: 4)
Performance on assignments in the information technology project management course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8000 Project Management

**Target for O4: Manage projects and balance resources**
4.0
M 8: Innovation systems integration student work (O: 5)
Performance on assignments in the systems integration course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8020 Systems Integration

Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology & process  
4.0

M 9: Build and renew business innovation student work (O: 5)
Performance on assignments in the business innovation course as indicated by the review of representative student work using the appropriate portions of survey CIS 8010 Process / Business Innovation

Target for O5: Build and renew business via technology & process 
4.0

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 [link]

Target for O6: Communicate effectively.  
4.0

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

Implementation Description: 1/30/2007  
Responsible Person/Group: CIS GPC and Assessment Coordinator

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

Implementation Description: 2/1/2008  
Responsible Person/Group: CIS Graduate Program Council

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Computer Science Assessment of Core
As of 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
It is critical for all students to master a basic understanding of computing due to its pervasiveness. Also, due to its rapidly changing nature it is imperative students learn the concepts that underlie this discipline. One of the missions of the Department of Computer Science is to provide high quality instruction in the CSC 1010 course that incorporates computing fundamentals and the latest technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Computer Components – Hardware and Software (M: 4)
Students will learn about the various components that make up a computer

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology
Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
**SLO 3: Spreadsheet Application Software (M: 1, 3)**

Students will learn the necessary components of spreadsheet applications that will enable them to enter, calculate, manipulate, and analyze data.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Presentation Application Software (M: 2)**

Students will learn the necessary components of presentation applications and presentation techniques that will enable them to effectively deliver information, findings, and projects to others.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Web Development (M: 5)**

Students will learn how to use the language of the Internet (HTML) in order to create web pages. This includes creating links so that users can navigate from one page to another.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Word Processing Application Software (M: 3)**

Students will learn the necessary components of word processing that will enable them to write term papers, reports, and research papers

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Chart drawing (O: 3)**

Students are to extract data from a spreadsheet and use this to draw charts for various functions. This includes formatting the charts as well.

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**
Proper curves should be generated for charts with appropriate labels

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
About 88% of the students were able to do this correctly.

**M 2: Formatting slides (O: 4)**

Students should create slides to demonstrate some functions. This includes labeling the slides appropriately.

**Target for O4: Presentation Application Software**
The presentation should include multiple number of slides with appropriate titles. Each slide importing figures or text accordingly.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Most students could generate the slides accordingly. The imported figures were not always formatted as well as expected.

**M 3: Generate documents (O: 2, 3)**

Students should generate a document that imports charts from a spreadsheet. The document should include comparisons as well as a variation in formats for headers and the text body.

**Target for O2: Word Processing Application Software**
The documents would not only include text, but also charts from a spreadsheet. The charts should be easy to read and the
description/comparisons should be detailed and formatted nicely.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Most often the charts were imported properly. However, the comparisons were not detailed enough. About 85% performed well with this.

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**
The documents would not only include text, but also charts from a spreadsheet. The charts should be easy to read and the description/comparisons should be detailed and formatted nicely.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Most often the charts were imported properly. However, the comparisons were not detailed enough. About 85% performed well with this.

**M 4: Comparison shopping for computer systems (O: 1)**
Students are asked to shop for computer systems for four different purposes. Each task has different requirements for the hardware and software components. Students should be able to justify why each system they chose meets the demand of the corresponding tasks.

**Target for O1: Computer Components -- Hardware and Software**
For each environment described, the students should be able to select the appropriate components that follow:
1) motherboard/cpu; 2) memory/hard disk space/ram; 3) adapter cards; 4) video/sound; 5) application software

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
About 90% of the students did well with this objective. The main problem was that they were not able to justify their choices clearly. This could be tied back to critical thinking or writing objectives.

**M 5: Website design (O: 5)**
Students are to design a website using HTML as the programming language. Their design has certain specifications required, such as linking pages, format, and headers.

**Target for O5: Web Development**
Students should be able to follow a flowchart for a website design. There should be multiple pages linked together including tags. The formats should adhere to specifications and include headers.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Tags were not always included properly. Linking pages tended to cause problems for some students so that the intended flow was not achieved.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
**Additional examples and quizzes**
With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Chart drawing | Outcome/Objective: Spreadsheet Application Software
- Measure: Formatting slides | Outcome/Objective: Presentation Application Software
- Measure: Generate documents | Outcome/Objective: Spreadsheet Application Software
- Measure: Generate documents | Outcome/Objective: Word Processing Application Software

**Implementation Description:** Spring 2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Anu Bourgeois

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
A majority of students are meeting the objectives of the course. This will enable them to have basic technology skills that will be beneficial regardless of their major.
**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
- 3 Collaboration
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

**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
- 7 Technology

**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
- 7 Technology

**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
- 3 Collaboration
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

**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
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Examinations: (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

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. The assessment 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding. However, the writing skills of our seniors could be improved.</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. The assessment 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding. However, the writing skills of our seniors could be improved.</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. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially 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. However, the writing skills of our seniors could be improved.

### 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. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially 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. However, the writing skills of our seniors could be improved.

### 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. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially 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. However, the writing skills of our seniors could be improved.

### M 4: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

### Target for O4: Programming Skills

The self-assessments will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
We have still not implemented this measure. The goal is to start this semester, Fall 2008.

**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
  - Measure: Computer Systems Development | Outcome/Objective: 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: Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Senior Oral and Written Presentations | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
  - Measure: Written Assignments and Reports | Outcome/Objective: 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
- Measure: Computer Systems Development | Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills

Implementation Description: September 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Staff and department faculty

**Suggest modification to 3000-level curriculum**
Explore possibilities to modify the curriculum that will supplement the deficiencies students have in discrete mathematics. This includes either introducing a new course at the 3000 level or modifying existing 3000 level courses. The curriculum committee is currently discussing this option.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Examinations: | Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics
- Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews | Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics
- Measure: Written Assignments and Reports | Outcome/Objective: Discrete Mathematics

Implementation Description: December 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Departmental curriculum committee

**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
- Measure: Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills

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: Hardware Systems
- Measure: Examinations: | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
- Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
- Measure: Senior Oral and Written Presentations | Outcome/Objective: 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
- Measure: Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | 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 collating 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
Implement Alumni Surveys
We will begin to ask alumni to complete surveys that will be included in the annual departmental newsletter.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Staff member
Additional Resources: Additional printing and mailing costs may be required if the newsletter is expanded.

Implement Senior Surveys
We will begin to ask seniors to complete surveys upon receiving their graduation audits.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews: | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
| Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Revise material for hardware courses
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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys: | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
Measure: Examinations: | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
Measure: Senior Oral and Written Presentations | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
Measure: Written Assignments and Reports | Outcome/Objective: Hardware Systems
Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Departmental Curriculum Committee

Track modification to curriculum requirements
The curriculum committee has recently revised the degree requirements and the changes went into effect Fall 2008. We would like to track the RPG rates as a result of these changes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys: | Outcome/Objective: Algorithm Design and Analysis
| Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills
| Computer Systems Development | Discrete Mathematics | Hardware Systems | Programming Skills
Implementation Description: Spring 2010
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 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. However, by having our own faculty teach discrete mathematics and targeting concepts that are particular to computer science, we hope to see improvements relatively soon.
**Mission / Purpose**

MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science M.S. Program provides students with the underpinnings of computation and the basic computer science for today's applications in industry, science, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research and Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 5, 6)**

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Communication (M: 1, 2, 6)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing and oral conventions and formats.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Collaboration (M: 2)**

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Computer Science Foundations (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students should be able to: 1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, (c) algorithm analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, and (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering. 2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations. 3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.

**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, 4, 5)**

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 (on going).

**Target for O1: Research and Critical Thinking**
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 M.S. students, 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 2007-2008 - 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: Communication
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 M.S. students, 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 2007-2008 - 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: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
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 M.S. students, 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 2007-2008 - 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: Computer Science Foundations
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 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 2007-2008 - 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)**
Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Computer Science Foundations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Examinations: (O: 4, 5)**

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 O4: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Computer Science Foundations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 4, 5)**

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 O4: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Computer Science Foundations**

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 2007-2008 - 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, 4, 5)
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: Research and Critical Thinking
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

Target for O4: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

Target for O5: Computer Science Foundations
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

M 6: Research Publications (O: 1, 2)
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: Research and Critical Thinking
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

Findings 2007-2008 - 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: Communication
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

Findings 2007-2008 - 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
Priority: Medium
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
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:** Low
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

**Collect data from alumni**
We will include a survey in our annual newsletter and send this out to alumni. The data collected will enable us to determine if students feel that their education prepared them for their jobs or future studies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alumni Surveys
- **Outcome/Objective:** Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
  | Computer Science Foundations
  | Research and Critical Thinking
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Staff member
- **Additional Resources:** Additional costs may be required for printing and mailing.

**Consider foundation courses for graduate program**
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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Alumni Surveys
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
- **Measure:** Examinations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
- **Measure:** Graduate Oral and Written Presentations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
- **Measure:** Thesis/Project Reports and Defenses
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
- **Measure:** Written Assignments and Reports
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computer Science Foundations
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2010
- **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 found strengths in the foundation material for computer science areas. 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?**
Within the foundation material, we found that discrete mathematics and computer organization and programming will require continued attention to improve student performance.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2007-2008 Computer Science PhD**
(As of 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST)
**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...
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: Communication (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Students communicate effectively using writing and oral conventions and formats appropriate to the research area in computer science.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Collaboration (M: 1)**

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities appropriate to the research area in computer science.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Research and Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Teaching (M: 4)**

Students should be able to teach and/or assist in undergraduate/beginning graduate courses.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Computer Science Foundations (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

Students should be able to: 1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, parallel and distributed computing (c) algorithm analysis, theory of computation, and complexity analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering, and (d) deductive databases and logic programming. 2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations, analyze computational complexity of problem formulations and applicable algorithmic approaches. 3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages, parallel and distributed computing to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Alumni Surveys: (O: 1, 2, 3, 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: Communication**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Collaboration**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Research and Critical Thinking**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Computer Science Foundations**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Research Publications (O: 1, 3, 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Communication**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Research and Critical Thinking**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Computer Science Foundations**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 3, 5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (ongoing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Communication**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 8 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: Research and Critical Thinking**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 8 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: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 8 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 Science Foundations**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 8 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Student evaluations (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations will be assessed to monitor the quality of teaching by our Ph.D. students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Teaching**

Ph.D. students should receive positive written comments for a majority of the responses. Additionally, we expect that the average of the answers for Question #17 on the evaluation to be above a 4.0

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

Each year for Honors Day, when selecting the recipient(s) for the Outstanding Teaching by a Graduate Student Award, the Honors Committee has found that most students receive high marks and comments on their evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Qualifying exam (O: 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. qualifying exam covers a breadth of the foundation material for the Computer Science curriculum. All Ph.D. students are required to pass this exam within the first three semesters of entry into the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

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 Qualifying Examination Committee.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.
# Target for O6: Computer Science Foundations

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 Qualifying Examination Committee.

## Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

## 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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

### Collection of data for 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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations
  - Bioinformatics (for students with concentration) | Collaboration | Communication | Research and Critical Thinking
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Staff person

### Consider foundation material for graduate courses

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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Qualifying exam
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations
  - Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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 most of the foundation material that is covered at the graduate level of courses.

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

Within the objective of computer science foundation material, discrete mathematics and computer organization and programming will require continued attention to improve student performance.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The overall goal of the concentration in business analysis is to provide the student with an understanding of the use of advanced statistical methods and software for managerial decision making. The techniques covered span the areas of management science, business intelligence, data mining and decision support systems. The emphasis is on application of software tools to create information and knowledge from data, and on the application of such knowledge for strategic and tactical decisions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 1, 5)
Students are able to state the key issues clearly and accurately recommendations for decision making.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
Institutional Priority Associations
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Understanding of Techniques (M: 3)
Students clearly understand the mathematical techniques used, and can apply them appropriately.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
Institutional Priority Associations
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Model Building Ability (M: 2, 4)
Student models are developed to accurately represent the situation, and neatly presented.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
Institutional Priority Associations
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Software skills (M: 4)
Students excel at manipulating the software package, going beyond what was demonstrated in the classroom.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
Institutional Priority Associations
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Interpretation of results, Ability to translate. (M: 5)
Students Can clearly interpret results, and present recommendations and supporting arguments cogently for purposes of business decision making

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualitative Analysis Skills (O: 1)
Instructors will rate students ability to state a situation’s key issues clearly and accurately on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.40

M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 3)
Instructors will rate students’ ability to develop and accurately represent the situation presented on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O3: Model Building Ability
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.40

M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 2)
Instructors will rate students’ ability to clearly understand the mathematical techniques used and apply them appropriately on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O2: Understanding of Techniques
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.40

M 4: Software Skills (O: 3, 4)
Instructors will rate students’ ability to manipulate applicable software packages, going beyond what was demonstrated in the classroom on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for O3: Model Building Ability
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.33.
Target for **O4: Software skills**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.33.

**M 5: Interpretation and Translation (O: 1, 5)**
Instructors will rate students’ ability to clearly interpret results and cogently present recommendations and supporting arguments on a four-category rubric where Excellent = 4, Competent = 3, Less than Competent = 2 and Ineffective = 1.

Target for **O1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.63.

Target for **O5: Interpretation of results, Ability to translate.**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
27 students in five different courses were evaluated by three different instructors on this measure using a common rubric with a resulting average score of 3.63.

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

**Updating Course Material**
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
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Business Analysis Faculty Members
## 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 (M: 1)

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 (M: 1)

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 (M: 1)

Students should be able to write and effectively present a comprehensive business plan for a new organizational opportunity.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Personal Depth (M: 1)

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Skill Demonstration (M: 1)

Prior to graduation students must demonstrate the ability to apply their knowledge and skills in entrepreneurship to real business situations.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

## Other Outcomes/Objectives

### O/O 6: Student Satisfaction (M: 1)

Students will be satisfied with the quality of their education and the degree to which the MBA Concentration in Entrepreneurship prepares them to recognize business opportunities and to start new organizations.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 7: Continual Improvement (M: 1)

Continually improve the MBA Concentration in Entrepreneurship through periodic assessments of program quality and through program change that is responsive to those assessments.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: In Development (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

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 O1: Attitudes and Behaviors**
The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O2: Analytical Skills**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O3: Business Planning Skills**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O4: Personal Depth**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O5: Skill Demonstration**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O6: Student Satisfaction**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

**Target for O7: Continual Improvement**

The Performance Targets for the MBA concentration in Entrepreneurship are currently under development.

---

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ben Oviatt
- **Additional Resources:** None

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Business Administration in Human Resource Management program prepares students for general business management careers with an emphasis on using Human Resources practices and procedures to increase workforce efficiency and effectiveness. Students receive detailed knowledge of selected functional areas of Human Resources to aid them in formulating legal, motivational, and cost-effective Human Resources policies or to prepare them for Human Resources generalist practices.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Basic Principles (M: 3)**

Demonstrate a detailed understanding of fundamental components and legal constraints of selected functional areas of Human Resource.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Best Practices (M: 2)**

Evaluate and formulate best practices for addressing employee-related issues.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: HR and Strategy (M: 4)**
Understand linkages between Human Resource practices and organizational policies and strategy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking  
5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: HR and Law (M: 5)**
Understand how employment laws contribute to organizational policies and procedures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking  
5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: HR and Productivity (M: 6)**
Formulate organizational policies and procedures to ensure legal compliance and productivity.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking  
5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Compensation (M: 1)**
Demonstrate techniques for managing individual performance and rewards.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking  
5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Compensation System Skills (O: 2)**
(1) Performance on assignments in MGS 8300 and other HR courses; (2) Graduate survey.

**Target for O2: Compensation**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
(1) Faculty rating 3.6 shows improvement. (2) Student survey indicated 15% of graduates want more practice in giving performance feedback.

**M 2: Best Practice Evaluation (O: 3)**
(1) Performance on assignments in MGS 8300 and other HR courses; (2) Graduate survey.

**Target for O3: Best Practices**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
(1) Faculty rating was 3.3 for slight decline over last year. (2) 50% of students wanted more “practical” advice on terminating problem employees.

**M 3: Fundamentals of HR (O: 1)**
(1) Performance on projects and examinations in MGS 8300 and other HR courses; (2) Graduate survey.
### Target for O1: Basic Principles

- **Target to be developed**

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  
  1. Faculty rating of 3.6 shows improvement in one year. (2) Graduate surveys indicate satisfaction with this criterion.

### M 4: HR Strategy (O: 4)

(1) Performance on writing assignments in MGS 8300 and other HR courses; (2) Graduate survey.

### Target for O4: HR and Strategy

- **Target to be developed**

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  
  1. Faculty rating of 3.7 shows slight improvement. (2) Graduate survey indicates adequate coverage.

### M 5: HR Law (O: 5)

(1) Performance on MGS 8300 and other HR assignments; (2) Graduate survey.

### Target for O5: HR and Law

- **Target to be developed**

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  
  1. Faculty rating of 3.2. Faculty indicated a student emphasis on detail in learning the material instead of looking at the larger picture. (2) No feedback from graduates.

### M 6: Policy Formulation (O: 6)

(1) Faculty ratings of student assignments and examinations in MGS 8300 and other HR courses; (2) Graduate survey.

### Target for O6: HR and Productivity

- **Target to be developed**

  **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
  
  1. Faculty rating of 3.3. (2) No feedback from student surveys.

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

#### Implementation of Assessment

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None

#### 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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty Members

**Basic Principles**
Actions to be taken: None.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Fundamentals of HR | Outcome/Objective: Basic Principles
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Best Practice**
Actions to be taken: (1) Develop a simple hand-out of “Discipline Guidelines” for students in MGS 8300 and MGS 8390.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Best Practice Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Best Practices
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg

**Compensation**
Actions to be taken: (1) Include a short case in MGS 8300 in which students role play giving performance feedback.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Compensation System Skills | Outcome/Objective: Compensation
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg

**HR and Strategy**
Actions to be taken: None.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: HR Strategy | Outcome/Objective: HR and Strategy
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg
- **Additional Resources:** None

**HR and the Law**
Actions to be taken: (1) Include a case in MGS 8300 that allows discussion and application of general policies and procedures rather
than specific laws as relates to specific situations.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: HR Law  
- Outcome/Objective: HR and Law  
**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg

---

**Policy Formation**

Actions to be taken: (1) Include a case in MGS 8300 that requires students to produce an actual statement of HR policy.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Policy Formulation  
- Outcome/Objective: HR and Productivity  
**Implementation Description:** December 1st 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

This year the assessment of the MBA Concentration was modified with a new Mission statement and a new approach to measuring. This was one to more precisely measure the skill and knowledge levels we would like to have MBAs with an HR concentration obtain in contrast to those students who are taking the more focused MS in HR. The MS in HR assessment was similarly changed. There was enough similarity in the topics measured, however, to draw some general conclusions. The following areas showed improvement, although sometimes only slight: Measures 1, 2 and 5.

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

Areas showing no change were 3 and 4, which also have low averages on the Likert-type scale measures. Item 6 actually showed a small decline and was also an item of relatively low performance in the prior cycle. The combination on no improvement and low base scores amplifies the need for attention here.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Concentration in Operations Management MBA**

**Mission / Purpose**

Operations management (OM) with its focus on resource and supply chain management enhances the firm's ability to produce and deliver goods and services. OM provides the tools and skills that complement the firm's organization structure and management expertise.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Supply Chain Management (M: 3)**

The student should be able to identify critical success factors of the supply chain management system for an organization, describe key elements of contemporary supply chain management, identify the critical success factors of designing and implementing a total quality management, service operations and describe the key elements required in planning and controlling.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Identify, Define, and Develop (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

The ability to identify and define alternative operations strategies for a given business environment and to develop the appropriate process, product design and technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking
Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: 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.

Institutional Priority Associations
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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: Identify, Define, and Develop
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.00; sub item c, 2.33. Qualitative comments from instructors showed that all areas were adequate across courses, however room for improvement remained. Lack of experience is suggested as a cause for the lack of desired depth in many projects.

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: Identify, Define, and Develop
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.00; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.67. Instructors suggested that students had these capabilities in general. Integration, however, takes a bit more effort than some groups were willing to put into their projects; this is seen as an area in which students cut corners when time is pressing to complete their work.

M 3: Performance (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: 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 O2: Supply Chain Management
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.00. Instructors were generally favorable to performance in this area in their qualitative comments but also suggested that students often times were not as strong in application of quantitative analysis as they were in qualitative analysis.

Target for O3: Identify, Define, and Develop
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.00. Instructors were generally favorable to performance in this area in their qualitative comments but also suggested that students often times were not as strong in application of quantitative analysis as they were in qualitative analysis.

### M 4: Team Skills (O: 1, 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 O1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.00; sub item b, 1.50. Qualitative evaluations showed this to be a strong point. Comments were made, however, about the quality of general presentation skills and the varying degree of expertise within the groups.

#### Target for O3: Identify, Define, and Develop

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.00; sub item b, 1.50. Qualitative evaluations showed this to be a strong point. Comments were made, however, about the quality of general presentation skills and the varying degree of expertise within the groups.

### 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

**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

**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: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: 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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members

**Attention to the Details**
More emphasis will be place on the analysis of smaller details within the projects as well as on the overall picture of the process.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

**Changing Some Assessment Venues**
•Change the assessment of the electives to include only MGS 8770 and MGS 8710 and MGS 8740. MGS 8760 does not consistently have a major project.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

**Emphasis of Distinctions between MBA & MS students**
Next year's assessment will include the tracking of the differences between MBA students with a concentration in operations management and MS students with a major in operations management. Redesigned and refocused questionnaires will be implemented for both types of students. Already the new Mission and Objectives have been loaded into Weave and are included in this report.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  - Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

Additional Resources: None
OM Integration Emphasis

• Continue and increase the focus on the relationships between OM and the other functions within the organization, this includes the highlighting of OM and its overall importance.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop
  Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify, Define, and Develop

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

• Reasoned analysis: The students continue to show general strength in their ability to develop the structure of an organization from a macro point of view. They have also shown some improved ability to relate this information to a more diverse set of issues. The development of a high level of analysis was a strong point on these students work, included both depth and breadth of analysis.

• Integrated recommendations: The feedback from the student teams showed a strong ability to develop integrated solutions.

• Identify critical success factors: The students had gained many insights into the importance of the analytical tools in making proposals that will make the company and its supply chain more competitive. The students continue to perform well on the analytical portion of their project work.

• Student contribution on project: Their insight into the overall industry was apparent in the projects that the teams worked on; this is related to students who have job experience that required them to work within an organization. Their project work indicated they were able to relate their work experiences into the class room setting.

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

• Emphasis needs to be increased on gaining the details in the analysis of a process or supply chain. Including the input of the instructor early on in the class.
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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
  2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

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
  2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

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.

**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.

**Target for O3: Managerial Skill Set**

Having 80% of the students at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each course is desired.

**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
### 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 28 students and had 14 students who graduate with the Ph.D. degree during this assessment cycle.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients (M: 8, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared to work with clients who are culturally and individually different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Use and conduct research (M: 2, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use and conduct research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Understands relevant theories (M: 1, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand theories of human development, psychopathology, counseling process, and behavior change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice (M: 3, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Is proficient in key areas of the profession (M: 4, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understands relevant theories**

100% passing grades on theory comprehensive examination question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our students passed the theory question in comprehensive exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: 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>

**Target for O1: Use and conduct research**

100% passing grades on research comprehensive examination question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our students passed the research question of comprehensive exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: 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>

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

100% passing grades on Ethics comprehensive examination question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our students passed the ethics question in comprehensive exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of our students passed the ethics question in comprehensive exams.

**M 4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students received satisfactory or higher ratings by their supervisors during mid-term and end-of-semester written evaluations and oral feedback.

**M 5: Performance in theories courses (O: 2)**

Performance in theories courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)

**Target for O2: Understands relevant theories**

Ratings by instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grade in theories coursework

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.

**M 6: Performance in Ethics course (O: 3)**

Performance in Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530).

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

Ratings by instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grade in Ethics course

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.

**M 7: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 3)**

Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all items to be satisfactory.

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

100% of students receive a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories relating to professional ethics.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by their supervisors on professional ethics during mid-term and end-of-semester written evaluations and oral feedback.

**M 8: Performance in Advanced Multicultural course (O: 5)**

Performance in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course (i.e., CPS 8340)

**Target for O5: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**

Ratings by instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grade in Advanced Multicultural Counseling course

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.

**M 9: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of our students obtain satisfactory or higher ratings by their supervisors on multicultural competency during midterm and end-of-semester written evaluations and oral feedback.

**M 10: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 4)**

Performance in didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)
**Target for O4: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
Ratings by instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grades in didactic courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 11: Performance in research courses (O: 1)**
Performance in courses about research methods (e.g., EPRS 8530, EPRS 8540, EPRS 9820, CPS 9920).

**Target for O1: Use and conduct research**
Ratings by instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grades in research courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all assignments in research courses, research design assignments, and research projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: Research comprehensive examination question | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research
- **Implementation Description:** On-going
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

### Practicum and Internship Support
To provide improved oversight of off-campus practicum experience and prepare students for internship applications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Evaluation by practicum supervisor | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice
  - Measure: Evaluation by practicum supervisor | Outcome/Objective: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients
  - Measure: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors | Outcome/Objective: Is proficient in key areas of the profession
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Practicum and Internship Coordinator

### To implement curriculum changes
To change the credit hours of practicum and internship in order to be more responsive to training goals and student needs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors | Outcome/Objective: Is proficient in key areas of the profession
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

### To offer training on psychology history
To offer a seminar every other year to cover the content of psychology history and system.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Comprehensive examination question on ethics | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Counselor Education PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 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;

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

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;

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Prepared to provide supervision (M: 3)
Student 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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**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. Mentor assesses the competency level of the student via observations and ability of student to use feedback.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

1. All CEP students who were required to submit a professional portfolio received a passing grade. 2. CEP students who were engaged in teaching either as the lead instructor or as a teaching assistant received passing feedback by their faculty mentor.

**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 on the research component of the comprehensive study. 2. Students will successfully complete a predissertation study. 3. Students will submit their predissertation study for either publication or for a professional presentation at either the regional or national level.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

1. All students (N=4) who completed their comprehensive examination during the 2007-2008 academic school year, successfully passed the research component of the comprehensive examination. 2. CEP students (N=4) successfully completed their predissertation study.

**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. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

1. Students who were engaged in practicum in supervision (N=3) received favorable evaluation from their supervisor.

**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. Discuss the ethical, legal, and multicultural implications of your program.

**Target for O3: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

1. Acceptable professional and ethical behavior as evaluated by the supervisors of their practicum and internship. 2. 100% passing grades on written comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

1. Students engaged in practicum and internship experiences received favorable evaluations from their practicum/internship experience. 2. CEP students (N=4) who took their written comprehensive examination all received passing grades.

**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

Evaluation form for practicum/internship
The CEP coordinator will develop an evaluation form to evaluate students who are engaged in practicum and internship in clinical settings.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Competent in professional & multicultural issues. | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: CEP Coordinator

Evaluation form for supervision
The CEP coordinator will develop an evaluation form for the practicum in supervision.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Competence in counseling supervision. | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to provide supervision

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: CEP program coordinator

Evaluation form for teaching
The CEP coordinator will develop an evaluation form for those who are completing their internship in teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Competence in instructing adults | Outcome/Objective: Teach effectively in university settings

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: CEP coordinator

Maintain current design; monitor student progress
The CEP program faculty will continue to maintain the current design and continue to monitor the stated student learning objectives and outcomes during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2008-2009 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 continue to meet program objectives.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Based on a review of last year's assessment, the CEP coordinator will create specific evaluation forms to quantify measures in teaching, clinical practice, and supervision.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Creative Writing MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)
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**
  1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Application of Literary Studies (M: 1, 2)
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**
  1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Craftsmanship (M: 1, 2)
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**
  1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 4: Revising Skills (M: 1)
Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. Students will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor, and to revise their creative works to create writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Effective Communications Skills (M: 1)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 6: Researching Skills (M: 1)
Students will conduct graduate-level research on topics related to English studies and will demonstrate mastery in using traditional methods of research as well as non-traditional information technology.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 7: Evaluative Skills (M: 1)
Student will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: M.F.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

Target for O3: Craftsmanship
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

Target for O4: Revising Skills
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

Target for O5: Effective Communications Skills
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

Target for O6: Researching Skills
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

### Target for O7: Evaluative Skills
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No assessment data was produced for the M.F.A. thesis during 2007-2008.

### M 2: Assessing M.F.A. exams (O: 1, 2, 3)
M.F.A. students in Creative Writing are required to pass two four-hour exit exams given over two days. The exam given on the first day tests the student’s knowledge of literary vocabulary, major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student’s chosen genre before the twentieth century. The exam given on the second day tests the student’s knowledge of major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student’s chosen genre after the beginning of the twentieth century. Each M.F.A. exam is read and graded by a committee of three members of the English faculty chosen by the student. The committee consists of the student’s major professor, a second member who must be in the relevant area of creative writing, and a third member from the English department.

### Target for O1: Content Knowledge
This is the first year that the department has tracked M.F.A. exam results for assessment purposes. Therefore, no targets were set for 2007-2008.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked information on the M.F.A. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 0% of students received a high pass on the exams, 88.9% received a pass, and 11.1% received a low pass.

### Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies
This is the first year that the department has tracked M.F.A. exam results for assessment purposes. Therefore, no targets were set for 2007-2008.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked information on the M.F.A. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 0% of students received a high pass on the exams, 88.9% received a pass, and 11.1% received a low pass.

### Target for O3: Craftsmanship
This is the first year that the department has tracked M.F.A. exam results for assessment purposes. Therefore, no targets were set for 2007-2008.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked information on the M.F.A. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 0% of students received a high pass on the exams, 88.9% received a pass, and 11.1% received a low pass.

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

#### Create explanation sheet for M.F.A. thesis rankings
The Director of Creative Writing will create an explanation sheet that gives instruction on the rankings for the M.F.A. thesis assessment form, similar to the explanation sheet that was developed for the PhD dissertation assessment tool.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective)**:
  - Measure: M.F.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Application of Literary Studies
    - Content Knowledge | Craftsmanship | Revising Skills
- **Implementation Description**: The Assessment Coordinator will work with the Director of Creative Writing to develop this form.
- **Projected Completion Date**: 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Director of Creative Writing

#### 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**: Finished
- **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
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.

---

Enhance assessment for M.F.A. exams
When M.F.A. exams are read, reviewers provide commentary that explains their scoring to the Graduate Director along with a score of high pass, pass, low pass, or fail. To capture more assessment information from the exams, the Graduate Director will write a summary of the commentary of all the exams that can be used in the annual assessment report. Both the readers and the Graduate Director will be provided a copy of the relevant graduate learning outcomes to guide their commentary.

---

Set target for the M.F.A. thesis
Since this will be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.F.A. thesis, it is difficult to set particular targets for this measure. Therefore, the department will set a basic threshold of 4.5 (based on a six-point scale) for all the criteria used on the thesis assessment form. The data that are generated from the 2008-2009 results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.F.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

---

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
The results from the MFA exams are roughly equivalent to what we would expect or desire. We will develop more specific targets in the 2008-2009 report because by that point the Graduate Committee will have revisited the question of the nature and administration of the exams, there will be two year’s worth of data on the exams, and the Graduate Director will have provided a summary of written commentary from the exams. But, in general, this year’s exams suggest that students are generally meeting with success. This is further reinforced by the publishing accomplishments of many of the M.F.A. during the course of this year. Four M.F.A. students published fiction in literary journals, three published poetry, one won a fiction contest sponsored by Creative Loafing, and one published an article on a writer in an encyclopedia of southern culture. A detailed list of these noteworthy successes can be found at http://workshop.gsu.edu/news.html. One additional note about the M.F.A. assessment plan is that the assessment of teaching that was included in last year’s report has been deleted from this year’s report. The department decided that since only a portion of the MFA students are given the opportunity to teach in our program, we should not include this measure in our assessment report.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The thesis results and the assessment data related to the M.F.A. exam that will be generated in 2008-2009 will enable the department to better determine which outcomes or objectives require continued attention.
Mission / Purpose

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The faculty undertakes empirical examinations of multifaceted issues including how violence, drugs, social inequities, behavioral health issues, criminal justice involvement, and public policy impact individuals, families, communities, and the criminal justice system. 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 2008, our program had 430 majors. 90 students graduated with a BS degree during this assessment cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analyze Contemporary Issues (M: 1)

Students will analyze contemporary, multicultural, global, and international issues impacting crime and justice utilizing a social science perspective.

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

4 Critical Thinking

5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.2.1 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Contemporary issues examination questions (O: 1)

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 2008 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 issues; and Goal IV.2.b: Students will effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. The instructors asked two questions related to each Goal on each examination and in each section of the course. The set of questions asked by each instructor was different substantively but addressed the stated goals. DABNEY’S SECTION Goal IV.1: Students effectively analyze contemporary issues with the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. 1. What is the central premise behind the criminogenic hypothesis of crime in the US? A. It argues that US society directly causes crime B. It argues that US society doesn’t cause crime but it’s organization and functioning increase the likely that crime will occur. C. It argues that crime and violence are inherent features in the human psyche. D. It argues that the spread of crime in the indirectly causes the social institutions of US society to break down or erode. 2. What do Messner and Rosenfeld mean when, in Chapter 1 of their book, they make the statement that “America is a society organized for crime?” A. They argue that the same core values that stimulate prosperity in the US also have the unfortunate consequence of producing high levels of crime. B. They argue that our fascination with punishing bad people outweighs our commitment to economic prosperity and societal growth. C. They argue that we stress community goals over individual needs and alienate people across the board. D. They argue that poor personal choices and greed is to blame for our crime problem. Goal IV. 2.a: Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural issues 1. Which of the following best describes Katz’s depiction of how the “code of the streets” is currently represented in American society? A. The code of the streets is almost exclusively concentrated in inner-city, ghetto communities B. The code of the streets is almost exclusively concentrated in Agansta wannabes that roam the suburban landscape and fringe of the inner-city C. The code of the streets is now ghetto-related but not ghetto specific B. It influence has spread outside of the inner-city D. The code of the streets is confined within the illegal drug market, regardless of where it exists geographically 2. Which type of community-based crime control initiatives are usually most popular on neighborhoods comprised of minority persons with limited economic means? A. Order maintenance B. Opportunity reduction C. Social problems approach D. Broken windows approach. Goal IV. 2.b: Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions. 1. Referring to the issue of income inequality, Beckett and Sasson reference an analysis of 65 countries that found homicide rates to be highest in what type of countries? A. Wealthy countries with democratic political systems B. Countries that follow...
a welfare state model C.Poor countries ruled by a dictatorship D.Developing communist countries 2.Which of the following was NOT mentioned as a factor that limits our ability to make accurate and reliable cross-national comparisons when it comes to the issue of crime rates? A.Cross-national differences in victim reporting practices B.Cross-national differences in the legal elements or definition of a given type of crime C.Not all countries collect and record crime statistics on the same time intervals D.Some industrialized countries provide only city-level crime statistics * BREZINA’S SECTION Goal IV.1: Students effectively analyze contemporary issues with the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. 1.According to the authors of Murder American Style, what can be said about violence in American society? A.Over the past few decades, violence has become a special problem in American society, with rates of violence that continue to rise. B. The United States has always had high rates of violent death and murder. * C. It is impossible to know whether today’s society is any more violent than in the past; murder statistics are too unreliable. D. Crime is an entirely subjective phenomenon; whether one considers violence to be a problem or not depends on one’s point of view. 2.The findings of the study titled “Becoming a Gang Member” are consistent with social learning theory because: A. Gang membership was associated with learning difficulties in school. B. The study highlighted the rewards that serve to reinforce gang involvement. * C. Individuals in the study who did not learn from punishment were at risk of gang involvement. D. In fact, the study failed to support social learning theory; others theories are required to explain the formation of youth street gangs. Goal IV.2.a: Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural questions 1.According to Elijah Anderson’s work on the “Code of the Streets,” the motivation for inner-city violence is * A. Status frustration B. Psychological disorder C. Media violence D. Addiction to drugs/alcohol 2. Feminist theories of intimate partner violence highlight which of the following? A. The learning of aggression through physical punishment B. Gender inequality C. Family stress and economic deprivation D. Heavy drinking Goal IV.2.b: Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions 1. When comparing the United States to other developed nations, which of the following statements best summarizes the American crime problem? A. What is unique about America is our level of lethal violence. * B. The U.S. has a unique problem with crime, with relatively high rates of both violent crime and property crime. C. American society is not really unique at all; international comparisons reveal few significant differences in rates of crime or violence. D. Contrary to popular belief, the United States actually has a relatively low crime rate. 2. Complete the following sentence: “Within the Western industrialized world, only Switzerland comes close to the United States in terms of gun ownership;...” A. Switzerland also comes close to the U.S. in levels of crime and inequality. B. Yet Switzerland remains a relatively peaceful nation, with a much lower rate of lethal violence. * C. The experience of both nations shows that guns cannot be managed in any society. D. In both nations we see that guns are inherently destructive of intent. ATALA’S SECTION Goal IV.1: Students effectively analyze contemporary issues with the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. 1. According to Messner & Rosenfeld, there are two basic dimensions of social organization. Those are: A. Time and place B. Crime and victimization C. Culture and social structure * D. None of the above 2. According to Messner & Rosenfeld, what are the building blocks of whole societies? A. Deviant behaviors B. Achievements C. Social institutions * D. All of the above Goal IV.2.a: Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural questions 1. One factor that has made the drug market appear attractive is: A. Urban manufacturing jobs becoming scarce B. Low paying degrading legitimate work C. Both A&B * D. None of the above 2. Which component of the above 2. Which component of the drug market does the cultural ethos of this country does Messner & Rosenfeld NOT discuss in their discussion of the American Dream? A. Achievement B. Individualism C. Victimization * D. Materialism Goal IV.2.b: Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions 1. According to Messner & Rosenfeld, when compared with nations at a comparable level of economic and political development, America clearly stands out as an unusually lethal country. A. True* B. False 2. Beckett & Sasson believe that when comparing sentences, the United States sentences for violent crimes were: A. Lower than other comparable countries B. Higher than other comparable countries C. Virtually equal than other comparable countries D. Not able to be compared with any other countries

Target for O1: Analyze Contemporary Issues

For the 2007-2008 assessment cycle the target performance level was to have at least 70% of students answer 70% of the embedded questions correctly.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

During the current assessment period three sections of CrJu 2200 were taught: one by Dr. Dabney, one by Dr. Brezina, and one by Ms. Atala, a part-time instructor. There was a combined total of 121 students (N=54 for Dabney, 7 for Brezina, and 60 for Atala). Provided below is the percentage of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions in each class: DR. DABNEY’S SECTION •Goal IV.1: Question 1 Pass Rate was 87%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 95%. •Goal IV.1.a: Question 3 Pass Rate was 89%, Question 4 Pass Rate was 89%. •Goal IV.2.b: Question 5 Pass Rate was 75%, Question 6 Pass Rate was 86%. DR. BREZINA’S SECTION •Goal IV.1: Question 1 Pass Rate was 71%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 86%. •Goal IV.1.a: Question 3 Pass Rate was 100%, Question 4 Pass Rate was 86%. •Goal IV.2.b: Question 5 Pass Rate was 71%, Question 6 Pass Rate was 100%. MS. ATALA’S SECTION •Goal IV.1: Question One Pass Rate was 79%, Question 2 Pass Rate was 92%. •Goal IV.1.a: Question 3 Pass Rate was 86%, Question 4 Pass Rate was 89%. •Goal IV.2.b: Question 5 Pass Rate was 80%, Question 6 Pass Rate was 94%.

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

Identify questions for comparative assessment

The instructors responsible for teaching CrJu 2200 will identify a set of examination questions that pertain to Objective 1 (Analyze contemporary issues). Prior to the semester in which the course is offered, teaching faculty will meet and agree upon at least two questions that will be embedded in each course examination throughout the semester. This measure will allow for comparative assessment across courses and instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary issues examination questions</td>
<td>Analyze Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Prior to the end of Fall Semester 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and faculty assigned to teach the course

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The Department continues to do well in meeting its goals related to analyzing contemporary issues. Although CrJu 2200 is a large class, students consider it a fun and engaging class, which addresses a diversity of contemporary criminological, sociological, and...
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The target level for this assessment cycle was to have at least 70% of the students answer 70% of the embedded examination questions correctly. Analysis of the data reflect that this level was easily achieved in every course and on every question leading to the conclusion that the target level was too low. As a result, the revised target performance level for 2008-2009 is to have 100% of the students answer at least 80% of the questions on each examination correctly. Additionally, three instructors were assigned to teach CrJu 2200. Each instructor used a different set of examination questions to assess the student learning objective related to contemporary issues. In the future teaching faculty should discuss and agree upon a set of questions that will allow assessment of student learning across classes and instructors.

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The faculty undertakes empirical examinations of multifaceted issues including how violence, drugs, social inequalities, behavioral health issues, criminal justice involvement, and public policy impact individuals, families, communities, and the criminal justice system. 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 2008, our program had 430 majors. 92 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9)

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).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### 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.
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication  
2. Oral Communication  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

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.

### Relevant Associations:

ACJS Certification Standard B.9

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Develop skills to promote career advancement (M: 1, 5, 8)

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  
2. Oral Communication  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues  
7. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### 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

2. Oral Communication  
4. Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 8: Apply scientific reasoning skills (M: 2, 5)

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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

#### SLO 9: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively (M: 2, 4, 5, 9)

Students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and effectively in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline. Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

#### SLO 10: Demonstrate the ability to speak effectively (M: 9)

Students will demonstrate the ability to speak effectively in a public setting on diverse issues related to crime and justice. Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

#### SLO 11: Demonstrate critical thinking skills (M: 2, 4, 5, 9)

Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically and will provide evidence of this skill through written and oral communications. Relevant Associations: ACJS Certification Standard B.9.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

#### SLO 12: Demonstrate use of technology (M: 7)

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
- 7 Technology

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of criminal justice seniors (n=92) completed the field placement as a requirement of graduation. 72% of field placement agencies reported that, on average, students had a sound knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and were well prepared for the job (mean=4.48 on a 5 point scale).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of criminal justice seniors (n=92) completed the field placement as a requirement of graduation. 72% of field placement agencies reported that, on average, students had a sound knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and were well prepared for the job (mean=4.48 on a 5 point scale).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of criminal justice seniors (n=92) completed the field placement as a requirement of graduation. 72% of field placement agencies reported that, on average, students had a sound knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and were well prepared for the job (mean=4.48 on a 5 point scale).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of criminal justice seniors (n=92) completed the field placement as a requirement of graduation. 72% of field placement agencies reported that, on average, students had a sound knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and were well prepared for the job (mean=4.48 on a 5 point scale).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of criminal justice seniors (n=92) completed the field placement as a requirement of graduation. 72% of field placement agencies reported that, on average, students had a sound knowledge of relevant criminal justice issues and were well prepared for the job (mean=4.48 on a 5 point scale).

**M 2: Writing intensive courses (O: 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11)**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading skills**
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O8: Apply scientific reasoning skills**
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O9: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively**
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O11: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**
75% of students will complete each writing intensive course with a grade of 70% or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Assessment data on this outcome is currently unavailable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of faculty continues to report that the classes taught reflect relevant and recent developments in the field. Additionally, in Spring semester 2008 the criminal justice department held a two day retreat to evaluate the undergraduate curriculum. Each individual course was assessed and a decision was made to keep, cut, and/or update the course curriculum. As a result of this evaluative process the department cut 8 courses and tentatively adopted 12 new courses that are more closely aligned with its identity statement. The task of determining the feasibility of implementing these changes, and the timeline for phasing them in, has been relegated to the Undergraduate Committee, which will report back to the faculty in Spring semester 2009. Additionally, to address retention issues, the faculty voted to add a Sophomore Learning Community to be implemented Fall semester 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Capstone portfolio (O: 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11)**
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Portfolio assessment data was available on 76 students (83%). Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolios of 86% of students evidenced their ability to read critically, 76% evidenced students’ ability to write critically, and 80% evidenced students’ ability to think analytically about crime and justice issues, components of the criminal justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Portfolio assessment data was available on 76 students (83%). Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolios of 86% of these students evidenced their ability to read critically, 76% evidenced students’ ability to write critically, and 80% evidenced students’ ability to think analytically about crime and justice issues, components of the criminal justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Portfolio assessment data was available on 76 students (83%). Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolios of 86% of these students evidenced their ability to read critically, 76% evidenced students’ ability to write critically, and 80% evidenced students’ ability to think analytically about crime and justice issues, components of the criminal justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Portfolio assessment data was available on 76 students (83%). Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolios of 86% of these students evidenced their ability to read critically, 76% evidenced students’ ability to write critically, and 80% evidenced students’ ability to think analytically about crime and justice issues, components of the criminal justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.

#### Target for O9: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Portfolio assessment data was available on 76 students (83%). Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolios of 86% of these students evidenced their ability to read critically, 76% evidenced students’ ability to write critically, and 80% evidenced students’ ability to think analytically about crime and justice issues, components of the criminal justice system, and the impact of criminological theory on criminal justice administration.

#### Target for O11: 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.

### M 5: Capstone papers (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11)

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 written assignment in the capstone series.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

#### Target for O4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

#### Target for O5: Evaluate the role of crime in society

100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

#### Target for O6: Develop skills to promote career advancement
100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

**Target for O7: Demonstrate critical reading skills**
100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

**Target for O8: Apply scientific reasoning skills**
100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

**Target for O9: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively**
100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

**Target for O11: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**
100% of students will receive a score of 70% or higher on each written assignment in the capstone series.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
97% of the graduating seniors (n=89) met the targeted performance level for the department.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Assessment data is available on 92 students. Performance scores ranged from 60 to 92%. The mean score for the group was 78%. 89% of students passed the examination on the first time with a score of 70% or better.

**Target for O4: Assess the role of law in criminal justice**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Assessment data is available on 92 students. Performance scores ranged from 60 to 92%. The mean score for the group was 78%. 89% of students passed the examination on the first time with a score of 70% or better.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Assessment data is available on 92 students. Performance scores ranged from 60 to 92%. The mean score for the group was 78%. 89% of students passed the examination on the first time with a score of 70% or better.

**M 7: Technological Skills (O: 12)**
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 use of technology**
100% of students will demonstrate an ability to use basic forms of technology including but not limited to computers, word processing software, internet resources, email, WebCT/Vista, and statistical software (SPSS).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Faculty evaluations were completed on 84% of graduating students in the capstone courses (CrJu 4930 & CrJu 4940). On a
scale of 1-5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, students received an average rating of 4.5 on their ability to use PowerPoint (4.6), word processing (4.93), and WebVista (ULearn) 3.99. This compares favorably with findings by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness Fall 2006-Summer 2007 Exit Survey, which determined that (as a group [n=44]; response rate=48.9%) recipients of undergraduate criminal justice degrees perceived an average increase in their ability to use technology from 3.95 on entering the department to 4.75 on exiting it. The NSSE 2007 report on senior criminal justice majors (n=21) is slightly less favorable. On a scale of 1-4, with 1=never and 4=very often, the department received a rating of 2.10 on students’ use of electronic mediums to complete assignments and 3.30 on their use of email to communicate with instructors. This compares to the University’s rating of 2.77 and 3.38 respectively.

**M 8: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In December 2007 the Department conducted a survey of Criminal Justice Alumni to assess how the program fulfills different learning outcomes. Of the 125 respondents, 9.6% were currently studying for an advanced degree and 32% had plans to pursue an advanced degree. 79% of alumni were employed (including service in the military) and 84.8% were satisfied or very satisfied with their careers. On a scale of A-F, 82.7% rated their criminal justice education a B or better with regard to preparing them to communicate effectively through writing; 78% believed they had learned to communicate effectively orally; and 90% thought they had learned to communicate effectively through writing. 89% of alumni rated their criminal justice education a B or better with regard to preparing them to study and understand crime using a social science approach; 73% thought their education prepared them for their career, profession, and graduate studies; and 96% believed they had developed a better understanding of the justice system. 90% of alumni rated their criminal justice education a B or better with regard to understanding the law; 88% developed a better understanding of crime. 92% rated their criminal justice education a B or better with regard to the quality of instruction in the major; 89% were pleased with the availability of courses in the major; and 86% thought the courses were appropriate for the major. 59% rated their criminal justice education a B or better with regard to the availability of research and independent study opportunities; 62% found the the quality of advisement acceptable; and 84% were satisfied overall with their experience in the major.

**M 9: Oral Reports (O: 3, 9, 10, 11)**

Each student will present two oral 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Assessment data was available on 76 students. For 87% of the students evaluated faculty agreed or strongly agreed that students received a satisfactory or better rating on the oral reports.

**Target for O9: Demonstrate the ability to write effectively**

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Assessment data was available on 76 students. For 87% of the students evaluated faculty agreed or strongly agreed that students received a satisfactory or better rating on the oral reports.

**Target for O10: Demonstrate the ability to speak effectively**

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Assessment data was available on 76 students. For 87% of the students evaluated faculty agreed or strongly agreed that students received a satisfactory or better rating on the oral reports.

**Target for O11: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**

100% of the oral progress reports will receive a rating of satisfactory (70%) or better.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Assessment data was available on 76 students. For 87% of the students evaluated faculty agreed or strongly agreed that students received a satisfactory or better rating on the oral reports.

**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:** Finished  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and all internship teaching faculty.

**Develop and maintain a strategic plan**  
Develop and maintain a strategic plan for the undergraduate program, monitor implementation, and report on progress toward goal attainment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**Establish benchmarks for curricular success**  
Establish and maintain benchmarks for undergraduate curricular success including the number and quality of Criminal Justice majors, recruitment measures, retention and placement trends.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of program**  
Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program and provide recommendations for improvements.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and all faculty.

**Reevaluate capstone examination**  
Reevaluate capstone examination to ensure that the content of the examination reflects the substantive information taught in the criminal justice curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**Review all learning outcomes**  
Review syllabi and curriculums to ensure that all basic learning outcomes are relevant, measurable and achievable.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Alumni Survey  
- Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement  
- Implementation Description: 2008  
- Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee
## Conduct a curriculum assessment

The Undergraduate Committee will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the criminal justice curriculum and make recommendations for improvement.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement
- Measure: Capstone portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate critical reading skills
- Measure: Critical thinking skills | Demonstrate the ability to write effectively
- Measure: Field placement experience | Outcome/Objective: Assess the role of law in criminal justice
- Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning skills
- Apply social science approach to study crime | Demonstrate critical reading skills | Demonstrate critical thinking skills | Demonstrate the ability to write effectively

**Implementation Description:** 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

## 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

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

## 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: Capstone portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Assess the role of law in criminal justice
- Measure: Critical thinking skills | Demonstrate the ability to write effectively
- Measure: Field placement experience | Outcome/Objective: Assess the role of law in criminal justice
- Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning skills
- Apply social science approach to study crime | Demonstrate critical reading skills | Demonstrate critical thinking skills | Demonstrate the ability to write effectively

**Implementation Description:** Spring Semester 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and Criminal Justice Faculty

## 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Develop skills to promote career advancement

**Implementation Description:** Complete draft by March 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

## 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and Faculty

## Adopt prerequisites and course sequencing

In a continuing effort to improve program quality and student retention the department will address diverse issues related
prerequisites and course sequencing.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Writing intensive courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning skills
- Apply social science approach to study crime | Demonstrate critical reading skills | Demonstrate critical thinking skills |
- Demonstrate the ability to write effectively | Demonstrate understanding of the justice system

Implementation Description: Spring semester 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Develop Undergraduate Program strategic plan
The department will continue to evaluate and, where appropriate, develop a strategic plan for implementing the curricular changes adopted by faculty at the 2008 Undergraduate Faculty Retreat.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Spring semester 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Implement and assess Sophomore Learning Community
The department will implement the Sophomore Learning Community effective Fall Semester 2008. Teaching faculty will collect data to be used for assessing program effectiveness regarding the achievement of learning outcomes and improvement of student retention.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and SLC teaching faculty

Require portfolio of major course-work
Currently all criminal justice students are required to develop a portfolio of work completed in the Internship during their last semester. At the 2008 Undergraduate Retreat faculty voted to require students to develop a portfolio of selected work completed during their tenure in the major.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Capstone papers | Outcome/Objective: Apply scientific reasoning skills
- Assess the role of law in criminal justice | Demonstrate critical reading skills | Demonstrate critical thinking skills |
- Demonstrate the ability to write effectively | Demonstrate understanding of the justice system |
- Demonstrate critical reading skills | Demonstrate critical thinking skills | Demonstrate the ability to write effectively |
- Demonstrate understanding of the justice system | Evaluate the role of crime in society

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall criminal justice students continue to perform well in the areas identified by the student learning outcomes. Students are meeting or exceeding the target performance goals relative to critical reading, writing, and thinking. With more field placement agencies reporting, employers are indicating that criminal justice students perform well in their placements and are job ready. This comports with data obtained by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness Exit Survey, which indicates that graduating seniors believe their academic program has prepared them for advanced study and for their careers. A majority would recommend GSU to a close friend or relative. Additionally, the Department has taken seriously the call for assessment and has undertaken a rigorous review of all courses resulting in proposed curriculum modifications that, when implemented, will be more closely aligned with the department’s mission and identity statements and students’ educational needs.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The department continues to make progress in the area of student assessment; however, continued attention must be devoted to data collection and analysis as a means to provide empirical support for programmatic changes.
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## 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.

## Goals

**G 1: Develop knowledge**  
Students will develop knowledge about crime and criminal justice systems and processes

**G 2: Critical thinking**  
Students will be able to think critically about issues related to crime and criminal justice policies

## 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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are no findings to report since no theses were completed during the 2007-2008 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.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Eight non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2008. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.38 to 4.63 (on a 5-point scale). The overall rating for the 18 survey items is 4.48. Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.38, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.63, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.53, 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. A comparison of this year’s findings with those reported for the 2006-2007 review indicate the same or improvement in the average ratings for all five of the learning outcomes (#1: 4.5 vs. 4.18; #2: 4.38 vs. 4.08; #3: 4.63 vs. 4.40; #4: 4.53 vs. 4.43; #5: 4.50 vs. 4.50). Also, while the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher was met by at least 80% of the students over the past two years, only three of the individual learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during the 2006-2007 review cycle, while all five of the learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during this review cycle.
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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eight non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2008. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.38 to 4.63 (on a 5-point scale). The overall rating for the 18 survey items is 4.48. Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.38, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.63, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.53, 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. A comparison of this year’s findings with those reported for the 2006-2007 review indicate the same or improvement in the average ratings for all five of the learning outcomes: #1: 4.5 vs. 4.18; #2: 4.38 vs. 4.08; #3: 4.63 vs. 4.40; #4: 4.53 vs. 4.43; #5: 4.50 vs. 4.50). Also, while the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher was met by at least 80% of the students over the past two years, only three of the individual learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during the 2006-2007 review cycle, while all five of the learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during this 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eight non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2008. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.38 to 4.63 (on a 5-point scale). The overall rating for the 18 survey items is 4.48. Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.38, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.63, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.53, 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. A comparison of this year’s findings with those reported for the 2006-2007 review indicate the same or improvement in the average ratings for all five of the learning outcomes: #1: 4.5 vs. 4.18; #2: 4.38 vs. 4.08; #3: 4.63 vs. 4.40; #4: 4.53 vs. 4.43; #5: 4.50 vs. 4.50). Also, while the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher was met by at least 80% of the students over the past two years, only three of the individual learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during the 2006-2007 review cycle, while all five of the learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during this 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eight non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2008. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.38 to 4.63 (on a 5-point scale). The overall rating for the 18 survey items is 4.48. Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.38, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.63, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.53, 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. A comparison of this year’s findings with those reported for the 2006-2007 review indicate the same or improvement in the average ratings for all five of the learning outcomes: #1: 4.5 vs. 4.18; #2: 4.38 vs. 4.08; #3: 4.63 vs. 4.40; #4: 4.53 vs. 4.43; #5: 4.50 vs. 4.50). Also, while the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher was met by at least 80% of the students over the past two years, only three of the individual learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during the 2006-2007 review cycle, while all five of the learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during this 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eight non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during Spring semester, 2008. The average ratings for the five individual learning outcomes ranged from 4.38 to 4.63 (on a 5-point scale). The overall rating for the 18 survey items is 4.48. Specifically, the average rating for learning outcome #1 is 4.50, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #2 is 4.38, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #3 is 4.63, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. The average rating for learning outcome #4 is 4.53, 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. A comparison of this year’s findings with those reported for the 2006-2007 review indicate the same or improvement in the average ratings for all five of the learning outcomes: #1: 4.5 vs. 4.18; #2: 4.38 vs. 4.08; #3: 4.63 vs. 4.40; #4: 4.53 vs. 4.43; #5: 4.50 vs. 4.50). Also, while the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher was met by at least 80% of the students over the past two years, only three of the individual learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during the 2006-2007 review cycle, while all five of the learning outcomes were met at the 100% level during this 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
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 instructional 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: 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 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

Capstone Seminar Review

As planned, the graduate committee revised the course syllabus for the Capstone Seminar and it was reviewed and approved by the Criminal Justice faculty and the CHHS Academic Affairs committee. The course was then approved at the college’s faculty and staff meeting during the Fall semester, 2007. Despite the approval of the Capstone Seminar syllabus, the graduate committee conducted a partial assessment of the course and identified several changes to the instructional plan and course requirements such that they are congruent with the student learning outcomes. First, selected readings will be required in order to develop an integrated understanding and discussion of the various components of the criminal justice system (i.e., meeting learning outcomes #1, #2, and #5). Second, the course instructor and graduate committee will develop a rubric to assess the students’ research paper and its component parts (e.g., statement of the research problem). This will allow for more effective communication, in oral and written form, of students’ understanding and analysis of their specific crime or justice issue (i.e., meeting learning outcome #4). Third, because the Capstone Seminar for the non-thesis students is designed to be the counterpart to the Thesis for the thesis students, the graduate committee discussed and approved the decision to rotate the teaching of the seminar among its Graduate Status faculty. With a new instructor scheduled to teach the capstone seminar during Spring, 2009, the graduate committee has planned another assessment following the completion of the course (i.e., during Fall semester, 2009). To accomplish this task, the graduate coordinator will first meet with the instructor to review the instructional 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.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
**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, 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Coordinator, Graduate Committee, and the Instructor

**Finalization of Alumni Survey**
Dr. Brian Payne joined the department as the new chair effective July 1, 2007. The department conducted an evaluation of the B.S. program, as part of a comprehensive assessment of the department’s current strategic plan. The department had a two-part retreat during January, 2008 to develop the department’s identity statement, review the B.S. curriculum and course offerings, and evaluate the undergraduate internship program. Changes to the undergraduate curriculum and internship program are in progress. The department’s new identity statement is as follows: The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. This statement will be used for a variety of purposes, including curriculum development and changes in the B.S. and M.S. programs. The plan is to conduct an evaluation of the M.S. program, although no timeline has been developed at this time. With the recent change to a new graduate coordinator effective May 15, 2008, the department chair and new graduate coordinator must meet to discuss a plan of action. In the meantime, the alumni survey has been suspended, pending a decision about a M.S. program review. It may be determined that the alumni survey may be a part of this review. In any case, Dr. Payne, in conjunction with the graduate committee, will review the instrument and offer suggested changes and additions to it.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**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:** To be determined  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department chair, graduate coordinator, and graduate committee

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Our non-thesis students demonstrated competence in all five of the learning outcome areas. The students’ ratings in the Capstone Seminar for this year’s review cycle exceeded those for the 2006-2007 review cycle.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Although the target level criteria were met for all of the learning outcomes, a preliminary review of the Capstone Seminar syllabus indicated that additional actions (e.g., required readings, rubric assessment of research paper) are needed to meet the learning outcomes associated with the Capstone Seminar.

---
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#### Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science Program in Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University is to prepare instructional personnel who will be qualified to direct the education of young children from pre-school through elementary grades. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experience and collaboration among school and university faculty combine to develop a program that supports the professional growth of the novice educator.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning (M: 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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
### 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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Quantitative Skills  
6. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: 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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration
SLO 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 1)
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associates
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 7: 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

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associates
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Effectively teaches 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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associates
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 9: Motivates and manages 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.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 10: Effectively plans for instruction (M: 2)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Relevant Associations:** NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating: Communication & Technology (O: 6)**

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.

**Target for O6: Uses communication skills and technology**
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
96% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 6: Uses communication skills and technology

**M 2: Faculty Rating: Planning for Instruction (O: 10)**

The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 7: a.) Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.) Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 7, c.) Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to planning for instruction.

**Target for O10: Effectively plans for instruction**
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
96% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 7: Effectively plans for instruction

**M 3: Faculty Rating: Motivation & Management (O: 9)**

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)

**Target for O9: Motivates and manages students for learning**
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
94% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 6: Motivates and manages students for learning

M 4: Faculty Rating: Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 5)
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

Target for O5: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

M 5: Faculty Rating: Professional Reflection (O: 2)
The following course assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and are entered into the STARS Database for Standard 9: a.)Planning, Teaching, Learning Module Cross-Curriculum Unit "Reflecting on Practice" component from ECE 4661 (Student Teaching), b.)Faculty/supervisor portfolio evaluations of Standard 9, c.)Final Student Teaching Evaluations based on data from Field Experience Observations related to professional reflection, "Reflections post-teaching" across all ten standards

Target for O2: Practices professional reflection
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program 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
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
97% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program 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
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

M 8: Faculty Rating: Understanding Student Development (O: 7)
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 O7: Applies knowledge of child development to learning

95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 2: Applies knowledge of child development to learning.

### M 9: Faculty Rating: Teaching Diverse Learners (O: 8)

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 O8: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners

95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program candidates met Standard 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of 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

95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of the Traditional BSED Program candidates and 100% of the Dual Certification BSED Program 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:

1. 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

**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
**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

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.

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

**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.

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

**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 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.

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007  
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

**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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned
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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Assessment for Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

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, thematic unit of lessons.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Communication & Technology | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Due to a second year of positive gains in student performance on Standard 1, content pedagogical knowledge, from 2006 - 2007 to 2007 to 2008, we will continue to monitor the positive effects of the current assessments in place. Three upper division math courses will continue to be required of Early Childhood Education majors to ensure high qualifications in this content area. In addition, student teachers will reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding “content and pedagogical knowledge,” following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Content Pedagogical Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

Effectively plans 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: 1) plan and implement during “role reversal” a five day, integrated, thematic unit or Planning, Teaching, Learning Module as well as instruction for ten full days, 2) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding planning and instruction, following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Planning for Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners
In order for candidates to continue to improve in their effectiveness to teach diverse groups of learners, we will continue to require all student teachers to: 1) work closely with the classroom cooperating teacher, the ESOL and/or special education teacher to develop and implement appropriate modifications/accommodations for children with diverse learning needs; 2) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding knowledge of students, following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric. The university supervisor will check for and observe the implementation of these modifications/accommodations during weekly visits and promote student reflection at each conference.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating: Teaching Diverse Learners | Outcome/Objective: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
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: 1) participate in conferences along with the cooperating teacher, 2) conduct at least one parent conference, and write a follow-up reflection to share with the university supervisor.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating | School/Community Relationships | Outcome/Objective: Fosters relationships with school and community
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

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 that all student teachers: 1) participate in a "Response to Intervention" Simulation & Seminar, completing an assignment requiring reflection 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; 3) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding the implementation of multiple instructional strategies, following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric. The university supervisor will check for and observe the implementation of these strategies and promote student reflection at each conference.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

Motivates and manages students for learning
In order for candidates to improve in the area of motivation and positive management of students for learning, we will require all student teachers to successfully: 1) participate in a "Response to Intervention" Simulation & Seminar, completing an assignment requiring reflection upon instructional and behavioral factors that impact student achievement; 2) design and implement a classroom center and management plan to be reviewed by the university supervisor, and 3) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding motivation and management, following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating | Motivation & Management | Outcome/Objective: Motivates and manages students for learning
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisor

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 using the newly developed Observation Rubric, 2) participate in a final conference with the university supervisor to present artifacts and rationales, representing all ten standards, from their Professional Portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating | Professional Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

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: 1) implement a Planning, Teaching, Learning Module assessment plan, "Assessing the Impact on Student Learning" component. The 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; 2) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding "assessment," following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating | Assessment for Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and Uses Assessment for Learning
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

Understands student development regarding learning
In order for candidates to continue to develop increasing understanding of how children learn and develop, we will continue to require...
student teachers to: 1) 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. This child portfolio will be shared with the university supervisor; 2) plan developmentally appropriate lessons, included in the Planning, Teaching, Learning Module, which will be implemented during the student teacher’s “role reversal” experience during Student Teaching; 3) reflect orally and in writing on the implementation of these plans and on performance regarding knowledge of students, following each supervisor observation, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Faculty Rating; Understanding Student Development  
- Outcome/Objective: Applies knowledge of child development to learning  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

**Uses communication skills and technology**  
As teachers are becoming increasingly responsible for their understanding and use of technology in the classroom, we will continue to require all student teachers: 1) implement at least one lesson incorporating technology as part of their Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM), a five day cross-curriculum unit of lessons, 2) reflect orally and in writing on performance regarding “usage and communication skills and technology,” following the implementation of the PTLM, using the newly developed Observation Rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Faculty Rating; Communication & Technology  
- Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Early Childhood Student Teaching Supervisors

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Our assessments show that our teacher candidates demonstrated expected or above performance levels for all ten standards on the established criteria (90%). This is the first year for Dual Certification Program candidate completers with data at 100% proficiency across all ten standards. In comparing Traditional Program candidate data from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008, data show a range of performance rating increases across all standards from 1% to 4%, excluding standard 5. Although data for standard 5 indicate a 1% decrease in performance from 95% to 94%, a rating of 94% for standard 5 is still above the target level of 90%. A possible explanation for the smaller increases across most standards and the slight decrease on one standard might be that we significantly raised the expectation level from 75% to 90% for 2006-2007 through 2007-2008.

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

In an attempt to raise performance to even higher levels, we changed our target level of proficiency to 95% for 2008-2009 and added to action plans additional opportunities for student teachers to reflect orally and in writing across all ten standards. We plan to monitor differences in ratings between Dual Certification and Traditional Program candidates. We continue to raise our expectations for teacher candidate performance to even higher levels by working to strengthen candidates’ knowledge and ability through well developed action plans in the five areas with the lowest percentage ratings (95% and below): Standard 1 (95%): Demonstrates content knowledge and pedagogy; Standard 2 (95%): Understands student development regarding learning; Standard 3 (95%): Effectively teaches groups of diverse learners; Standard 4 (95%): Plans and implements a variety of instructional strategies to motivate and meet the needs of all learners; Standard 5 (94%): Motivates and manages students for learning. All other assessments (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**

**2007-2008 Early Childhood Education EdS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose

The Educational Specialist in Early Childhood Education (Ed.S.) is designed to extend the academic and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers in their classrooms and schools in order to develop as teacher researchers. As a cohort group, participants collaborate with university faculty and each other to do work inside and outside their schools and classrooms. The program is based on the assumption that learning is a constructive process that 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 including virtual professional learning community, the Ed.S. program provides graduates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to serve as effective educational leaders and decision makers in their schools and communities. Successful completion of the program leads to a Specialist degree (T-6) and Teacher Support Specialist (T.S.S.) endorsements. Successful graduates may also apply 18 credit hours toward Ph.D. program in ECE after admission to doctoral program.

### 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. Educators have clear goals.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3 PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were 20 participants in the 07-08 program. 100% of the participants received GSI CITI training for research. 19/20 (95%) of the cohort completed all requirements for the Action Research Project including receiving IRB approvals from both GSU and School District Oversight Committees and presenting findings at the COE Sources of Educational Excellence Conference in May 2008.

### Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were 20 participants in the 07-08 program. 100% of the participants received GSI CITI training for research. 19/20 (95%) of the cohort completed all requirements for the Action Research Project including receiving IRB approvals from both GSU and School District Oversight Committees and presenting findings at the COE Sources of Educational Excellence Conference in May 2008.

### Target for O3: Applies expertise for learning and development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were 20 participants in the 07-08 program. 100% of the participants received GSI CITI training for research. 19/20 (95%) of the cohort completed all requirements for the Action Research Project including receiving IRB approvals from both GSU and School District Oversight Committees and presenting findings at the COE Sources of Educational Excellence Conference in May 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

19/20 (95%) participants successfully completed all Capstone requirements.

### Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

19/20 (95%) participants successfully completed all Capstone requirements.

### Target for O3: Applies expertise for learning and development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

19/20 (95%) participants successfully completed all Capstone requirements.

### Target for O4: Shows commitment to learning and development

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

19/20 (95%) participants successfully completed all Capstone requirements.

### Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities

All students will "meet" goals and 80% will "exceed goals".

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

19/20 (95%) participants successfully completed all Capstone requirements.

### M 3: Teacher Development Project (O: 2, 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 O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

All students will "meet" the standard and 80% will "exceed" the standard.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of participants successfully completed all requirements for Teacher Development Project.

### 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.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of participants successfully completed all requirements for Teacher Development Project.

### 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **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:** In-Progress
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2007
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EdS Program Coordinator

**Program Assessment Tools**

1. continue to collect and analyze data for year 2 of the new program to determine if the new model is indeed effective; 2. develop assessment tool to evaluate effectiveness of virtual learning community through the use of the wiki; 3. design and pilot new program assessments performance based measures(e.g., NBPTS video analysis rubric and use of field supervisor evaluator ratings by interns).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
  - Measure: Capstone Experience | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development, Participates in professional learning communities, Reflects on & learns from professional experience
- **Implementation Description:** June 2009
- **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?**

Action plan for 2006-2007 set high priority on revising the program. The new Ed.S. program was designed and approved by the COE academic affairs and the PEF executive council in 2007. New marketing materials were designed including revision of the website, brochure and several school information sessions conducted around the metro-Atlanta area. The new program began in summer 2007 with 20 participants. The redirection of the program to "teachers-as-researchers" was based on several factors: a. Emphasis on teachers-as-researchers allows the department to take advantage of existing faculty expertise in this area and begin collaboration...
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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 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, 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 2007-2008 academic year the UACM program recommended 22 candidates for a teaching certificate in Early Childhood Education.

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

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

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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

We need to continue to collect and analyze data for year 2 of the new program to determine if the new model is indeed effective. Specifically, the use of the wiki as a tool needs to be explored more fully and the establishment of an assessment tool developed (e.g., tracking system). In addition, the original program assessment plan identified the use of STARS data to help provide program information relevant to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Two data points were collected for 07-08. However, after analysis of the first transition point (January 2008), the program team discovered that the data may not provide the type of information needed to inform program decisions. We need to explore more specific program assessments aligned with the NBPTS standards such as performance based measures (e.g., NBPTS video analysis rubric, ratings as supervisors,...) or explore item analysis.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section

2007-2008 Early Childhood Education GATAPP
As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 3: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 7)

The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 4: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 5)

The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 5: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 3)

The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 4)

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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 7: Applies knowledge of child development (M: 1)

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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

SLO 8: Effectively plans for instruction (M: 6)
The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals. Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 9: Motivate and manage students for learning (M: 8)
The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners (M: 2)
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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating 2 - Student Development (O: 7)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2: a.) Child Case Study, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Target for O7: Applies knowledge of child development
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
97% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 2: Faculty Rating 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners (O: 10)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3: a.) Student Support Team Project, and b.) Field Experience Observations.

Target for O10: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
97% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 3: Faculty Rating 4-Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 5)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4: a.) ELL Responsive Instruction Analysis, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Target for O5: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

100% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

### M 4: Faculty Rating 1 - Content Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 6)

Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1: a.) Final Exam from ECE 6380 Foundations of Literacy for Young Children, b.) Final Exam from ECE 6390 Foundations of Learning and Teaching Mathematics, and c.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

97% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

### M 5: Faculty Rating 6 - Communication Skills and Tech. (O: 4)

Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6: a.) Critical Discourse Analysis, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O4: Uses communication skills and technology**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

98% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

### M 6: Faculty Rating 7 - Plan for Instruction (O: 8)

Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7: a.) Integrated Thematic Unit, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O8: Effectively plans for instruction**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

94% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

### M 7: Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning (O: 3)

Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8: a.) Mathematics Teaching and Learning Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O3: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

98% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

### M 8: Faculty Rating 5 - Motivate and Manage Students (O: 9)

Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5: a.) Classroom Management Plan, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O9: Motivate and manage students for learning**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

97% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.
M 9: Faculty Rating 9 - Professional Reflection (O: 2)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9: a.) Culturally Responsive Synthesis Paper, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Target for O2: Practices professional reflection
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
92% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 10: Faculty Rating 10 - Professional Relationships (O: 1)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10: a.) Parent Communication, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Target for O1: Fosters relationships with school and community
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: May 2007
Projected Completion Date: 03/2007
Responsible Person/Group: UAPP Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners | Outcome/Objective: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Content Pedagogical Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty Rating 4 - Multiple Instructional Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty Rating 5 - Motivate and Manage Students | Outcome/Objective: Motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating 7 - Plan for Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction

Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year
Projected Completion Date: 03/2007
Responsible Person/Group: UAMC Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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 one and two of the program (MEd.)

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Addition of an ESOL Endorsement
The UACM program will add an English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement to the Program of Study to meet the multiple instruction needs of the growing diverse population in Georgia. The program will go through the Professional Standards Commission virtual site visit October 18-21, 2009. This is the final approval process for offering the ESOL Endorsement as a part of the The Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 9 - Professional Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year
Projected Completion Date: 03/2008
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Monitor and Maintain
Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes and objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 10 - Professional Relationships | Outcome/Objective: Fosters relationships with school and community

Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Professional Development Schools
The UACM program has committed to the development and implementation of Professional Development Schools (PDS). Through PDS partnerships with area schools we can have a closer theory to practice connection. This will increase the quality of field placements and thus the quality of teacher preparation.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Teach Diverse Groups of Learners | Outcome/Objective: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 Academic Year
Projected Completion Date: 01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The results of the implementation of our action plan for the 2007-2008 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 measures from 81% (2006-2007) to 98% (2007-2008). This can be attributed to 1. improving the Student Learning Project (now called the Mathematics Teaching and Learning Project) to focus on both pre and post assessments, 2. expanding the Student Support Team simulation to include more training on various assessments that can be use to gather information about diverse learners in order to inform instruction, and 3. developing an Individual Professional Development Plan to meet individual candidates' needs. In addition, for the 2007-2008 academic year, we raised our cut score for our target performance level from 85% to 90% for all standards. 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. Understand and use 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 development and implementation of Professional Development Schools (PDS). Through PDS partnerships with area schools we can have a closer theory to practice connection. This will increase the quality of field placements and thus the quality of teacher preparation. Additionally, because of changing demographics in Atlanta, the faculty asserts that the addition of an English to Speakers of Other Languages Endorsement would train our teacher candidates to better meet the multiple instructional strategies needed to meet the growing diversity in our classroom (Standard 4).
**SLO 4: Educators reflect on their practice. (M: 1, 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Capstone Experience Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 4, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Out of 19 students: 3 students received 2/3 16 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.84. Therefore students as a whole met target

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Out of 19 students: 3 students received 2/3 16 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.84. Therefore students as a whole met target

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Out of 19 students: 3 students received 2/3 16 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.84. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Out of 19 students: 3 students received 2/3 16 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.84. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Out of 19 students: 2 students received 2/3 17 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.89. Therefore students as a whole met target

Target for O3: Educators manage and monitor student learning.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Out of 19 students: 2 students received 2/3 17 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.89. Therefore students as a whole met target

M 3: Benchmark (O: 4)
Benchmark is a mid-program personal written reflection that: (1) identifies three ways the program has altered personal conceptions of teaching and learning (2) provides specific examples which demonstrate the change, and (3) reflects on how these changes have impacted personal conceptions of teaching and learning.

Target for O4: Educators reflect on their practice.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Out of 19 students: 4 students received 2/3 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 19 is 2.79. 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

Add Alternative Format Requirement to Benchmark
The Benchmark serves two functions. One, it is a mid-program status-check on how the students are progressing in their knowledge and understanding of their own teaching and their and their students’ learning. Two, it provides an introduction to the requirements of the Capstone, submitted by the students at the end of the program. To strengthen the Benchmark’s accomplishment of the second function(preparation for the end of program Capstone) the students will be required to submit one portion of the Benchmark in a format other than written. Thus, students will be required to use an alternative formats(aural, visual, etc.).
**Emphasizing a Social Justice Focus for the CMP**

Participants in the CMP are receiving their Master's degree at an urban university within a College of Education Mission of providing cutting-edge solutions to what has been perceived intractable challenges to improving the educational experiences of children of color and children in poverty. Additionally, the focus is global the enactments are local. The CMP has over 12 years of experience with working with teachers in non-traditional ways. Primarily, the CMP is guided by constructivist principles of teaching and learning. Thus, the infrastructure of innovation, flexibility, decision-making framework, is well established. Beginning with the 2008-2009 cohort, the program directors will implementing strategies which make explicit the CMP’s focus on social justice. The first change made will be to replace the existing outcomes/objectives with others which provide an explicit written social justice framework.

**Expand Presentation Formats for Capstone**

Students demonstrate in their Capstones how the CMP program has changed their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to teaching and learning. This cohort was required to include a minimum of one non-written portion to their Capstone. The next cohort may now be submitted in a variety of multi-media forms.

**Explore possibilities Intergroup Field Visits**

Program Directors will seek funding via a Teacher Quality Grant to pay for teacher substitutes and gas to allow the program participants to visit each others' classrooms or to visit the classrooms of graduates from previous CMP cohorts. Program Directors will use their knowledge of the interests and strengths of current and former CMP students to pair with teachers in the current CMP Cohort.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Expansion of Formats for Capstone Inclusion of the alternative format component was very successful. Students used a variety of media and formats (photography, videos, interviews, student-created videos, power point, web pages, poetry) to represent changes made in their understanding of teaching and learning. Field A major change in the field is the format used for the students' reflections on the field visit was changed. Instead of giving them a form with the same three questions, the field observer, wrote down one or two questions for the students to respond to based on what she observed during the field visit. The questions were created to perform two purposes: one, to reflect on the visit and two, to nudge their thinking about how to move to the next step in accomplishing their field goal.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Integrating course content continues as a challenge. The monthly glue classes, designed by the program directors to nurture the CMP community and to integrate course content were decreased to allow for more focus on the action research project. The monthly glue classes are reinstated for the 2008-2009 cohort and book groups are added. The books from which the students could choose to read focused on social justice issues and will allow for examination of cross-course content.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP**
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(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. To prepare teachers for success in urban schools, the UACM faculty 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 2007-2008 academic year the UACM program recommended 13 candidates for a Master's Degree in Education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 3: Shows commitment to student learning & development (M: 1)**

The educator is committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning (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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**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**
Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Participates in professional learning communities (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 3)**
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1: a.) Problem Solution Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O3: Shows commitment to 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92% of the students met or exceeded an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard.

**M 2: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning (O: 1)**
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3: a.) Student Learning Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92% of the students met or exceeded an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard.

**M 3: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship (O: 5)**
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4: a.) Action Research Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O5: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
62% of the students met or exceeded an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard.

**M 4: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities (O: 2)**
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1: Cross Career Learning Community

**Target for O2: Participates in professional 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92% of the students met or exceeded an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard.

**M 5: Faculty Rating 2-Expertise for Learning & Develop (O: 4)**
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2: a.) Integrated Curriculum Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O4: Applies 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

92% of the students met or exceeded an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain and monitor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Ongoing for 2006-2007 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 03/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Nancy Schafer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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: Finished                               |
| Priority: Medium                                              |
| Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year           |
| Projected Completion Date: 03/2008                            |
| Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty                        |
| Additional Resources: N/A                                    |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)                  |

| 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 (CFGs). 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: Finished                               |
| Priority: Medium                                              |
| Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year           |
| Projected Completion Date: 03/2008                            |
| Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty                        |
| Additional Resources: N/A                                    |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)                  |

| 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. |
| Established in Cycle: 2006-2007                                |
| Implementation Status: Finished                               |
| Priority: High                                               |
| Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year           |
| Projected Completion Date: 03/2008                            |
| Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty                        |
| Additional Resources: N/A                                    |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)                  |

| Revise and Implement 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... |
| Established in Cycle: 2006-2007                                |
| Implementation Status: Finished                               |
| Priority: High                                               |
| Implementation Description: 2007-2008 Academic Year           |
| Projected Completion Date: 03/2008                            |
| Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty                        |
| Additional Resources: N/A                                    |
| Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)                  |
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: May 2008
Projected Completion Date: 03/2008
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Coordination of EPRS 7910, ECE 6830, and ECE 6831.
Faculty instructors from EPRS 7910 Action Research (a prerequisite for ECE 6830 and 6831), ECE 6830 Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education I, and ECE 6831 Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education II will coordinate their efforts to prepare Master’s candidates to understand and conduct action research. This will allow a seamless transition between theory (learning about action research) and practice (conducting action research). This collaboration will hopefully allow for more continuity, which should free time for the candidates to spend on analysis and reflection of their research results.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
Implementation Description: Summer 2009
Projected Completion Date: 05/2009
Responsible Person/Group: EPRS 7910, ECE 6830, and ECE 6831 Faculty Instructors and UACM Program Director
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Fine tune the Critical Theories/Research courses.
The Master’s candidates complete an Action Research Project in their Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education I and II courses. The faculty member who teaches these courses will restructure them to allow for more time for the candidates to work on their action research in class. This will allow the candidates to reflect on their research with collaboration from their professor and their peers.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | Outcome/Objective: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
Implementation Description: 2008-2009 Academic Year
Projected Completion Date: 03/2009
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty - Namisi Chilungu
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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. 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?
The UACM faculty is currently working to improve our candidates ability to meet Standard 4 (Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning) by: 1. continuing to coordinate the major projects schedule so that students have the time and space to think deeply about their pedagogy, 2. fine tuning the Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education I and II courses, and 3. coordinating the Action Research course (where students learn how to conduct action research) with the Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education I and II courses (where students conduct an action research project).
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. |
| Relevant Associations: NAEYC |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

| SLO 2: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers (M: 2) |
| Knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students' thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood education. |
| Relevant Associations: NAEYC |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

| SLO 3: Are active seekers of knowledge (M: 1, 3) |
| Active seekers of knowledge who remain current on theory and research and are able to critique, synthesize, and implement these ideas in their practice. |
| Relevant Associations: NAEYC |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

| SLO 4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers (M: 1, 3) |
| Completers are thoughtful writers and speakers who disseminate ideas through publication, electronic media, and other public venues. |
| Relevant Associations: NAEYC |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

- One student completed her research apprenticeship during this time period. Five doctoral students made presentations at national conferences; one student published an article in a national journal.

**Target for O3: Are active seekers of knowledge**

- Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
One student completed her research apprenticeship during this time period. Five doctoral students made presentations at national conferences; one student published an article in a national journal.

**Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers**
Each student is required to present the completed research or submit it for publication.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
One student completed her research apprenticeship during this time period. Five doctoral students made presentations at national conferences; one student published an article in a national journal.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
One student successfully completed her university teaching apprenticeship.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Four students successfully completed their comprehensive exams on their first attempt.

**Target for O4: Are thoughtful writers and speakers**
All students successfully complete their comprehensive examination on their first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Four students successfully completed their comprehensive exams on their first attempt.

### 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
  - Measure: Research Apprenticeship  |  Outcome/Objective: Are active seekers of knowledge
  - Measure: Teaching Apprenticeship  |  Outcome/Objective: Are knowledgeable and effective teachers
  - Measure: Are thoughtful writers and speakers
  - Measure: Demonstrates research skills

  **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
  **Responsible Person/Group:** PhD coordinator
Develop a new course for scholarly writers
A new course proposal was approved for a 3SH course in Developing Scholarly Writers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Are active seekers of knowledge
- **Measure:** Research Apprenticeship | **Outcome/Objective:** Are active seekers of knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Chair of PHD Committee

Develop courses for apprenticeships
Two course proposals will be submitted Fall 2008; one to convert the non-coursework university teaching apprenticeship to a 2SH course and the other to convert non-coursework teacher development apprenticeship to a 1SH course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Teaching Apprenticeship | **Outcome/Objective:** Are knowledgeable and effective teachers

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Chair of PHD Committee

Revise comprehensive exam components and process
The PHD advisory committee has completed a draft of a new comprehensive exam policy. It will be presented to the full committee for approval Fa 08.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Are thoughtful writers and speakers

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** PHD advisory Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The new annual review process implemented in fall 2007 provides a manageable way to collect data and monitor student progress. We will need to revise the process for fall 2008; newly admitted students will not be required to participate in the process.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Economics Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:12 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of Economics’s undergraduate program and its central role in the University core curriculum is to increase substantive knowledge, analytical skills and communication skills by educating students about economic principles and by imparting an appreciation of economic issues from a global perspective.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: contemporary issues 1 (M: 1)**

Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: contemporary issues 2 (M: 1)**

Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Contemporary Issues

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams (O: 1, 2)

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 2008 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 O1: contemporary issues 1

At least 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

For ECON 2100, the assessments were done in 5 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 273 students), and 94% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 89% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). For ECON 2105, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 170 students), and 76% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). For ECON 2106, the assessments were done in 3 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 346 students), and 76% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 79% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). See General Education Assessment Report for Department of Economics 2007-2008 for more details.

Target for O2: contemporary issues 2

At least 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

For ECON 2100, the assessments were done in 5 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 273 students), and 94% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 89% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). For ECON 2105, the assessments were done in 2 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 170 students), and 76% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 84% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). For ECON 2106, the assessments were done in 3 sections in Spring 2008 (a total of 346 students), and 76% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #1 (learning outcome 1); 79% got at least 3 out of 5 questions correct on contemporary issues goal #2 (learning outcome 2). See General Education Assessment Report for Department of Economics 2007-2008 for more details.

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

increase number of students assessed

Each year, the Department of Economics asks instructors of the economics courses in the core curriculum to volunteer to participate in assessment of the contemporary issues general education learning outcomes. In the future, we hope to get more instructors involved in the assessment, and therefore, increase the number of students assessed. Starting in Fall 2012, all instructors of ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106 will be required to participate in assessment efforts.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams
- Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues 1
- Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues 2

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee

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 continues to do well at teaching contemporary issues in our core courses. The targets for both goals were met. Roughly the same number of students in our core courses were assessed this year compared to last year (a total of 789 this year compared to a total of 793 last year). The targets were met this year in all courses. In some cases, there was improvement over last year; in other cases, the results were better last year; but in all cases, the targets were met.

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

The Department of Economics will continue to strive to assess more students each year. The results for the principles courses (2105 & 2106) were in general better last year. This may be due to the fact that the courses switched textbooks this year, and instructors may still be adjusting to the change.
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, 2, 3, 4, 5)
To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Benefits and costs (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: Economics Basic Theories (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2, 4)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score for all the students that took the TEs in Fall 2007 was 73% on the MicroTE and 65% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 69%. 88% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 56% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE. The higher grades and marked improvement in scores for the MicroTE may be partially reflective of the course's instructor, who specializes in microeconomics.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score for all the students that took the TEs in Fall 2007 was 73% on the MicroTE and 65% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 69%. 88% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 56% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE. The higher grades and marked improvement in scores for the MicroTE may be partially reflective of the course's instructor, who specializes in microeconomics.

**Target for O4: Economics Basic Theories**

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score for all the students that took the TEs in Fall 2007 was 73% on the MicroTE and 65% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 69%. 88% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 56% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE. The higher grades and marked improvement in scores for the MicroTE may be partially reflective of the course's instructor, who specializes in microeconomics.

#### M 2: Group Project in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the group project was 94.6%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**

The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the group project was 94.6%.

**Target for O3: Communication**

The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the group project was 94.6%.

Target for O4: Economics Basic Theories
The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the group project was 94.6%.

M 3: Exams and Quizzes in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade was 87.8% on the first exam, 84.6% on the second exam, and 93.3% for quizzes.

Target for O2: Benefits and costs
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade was 87.8% on the first exam, 84.6% on the second exam, and 93.3% for quizzes.

Target for O3: Communication
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade was 87.8% on the first exam, 84.6% on the second exam, and 93.3% for quizzes.

Target for O4: Economics Basic Theories
The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade was 87.8% on the first exam, 84.6% on the second exam, and 93.3% for quizzes.

M 4: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the individual book review was 90.6%.

Target for O2: Benefits and costs
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the individual book review was 90.6%.

Target for O3: Communication
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the individual book review was 90.6%.

Target for O4: Economics Basic Theories
The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average grade on the individual book review was 90.6%.

**M 5: Student Portfolio in ECON 4999 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 90%.

**Target for O2: Benefits and costs**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 90%.

**Target for O3: Communication**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 90%.

**Target for O4: Economics Basic Theories**

The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the student portfolio was 90%.

**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):
- Measure: Exams and Quizzes in ECON 4999 | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Communication | Economics Basic Theories
- Measure: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Communication | Economics Basic Theories
- Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Economics Basic Theories

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.

Make needed adjustments to ECON 4999
This is the second year that ECON 4999 was offered, and the first year to have substantial enrollment in the course. (34 students were enrolled for the full term in Fall 2007, as opposed to 10 in Spring 2007.) 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 may be part of the explanation behind the difference in the results on the MicroTE and MacroTE. In Spring 2008, the course was taught by a macroeconomist, and starting Fall 2008, it will be jointly taught by two instructors that specialize in each of macroeconomics and microeconomics. Grading for the individual book reviews and student portfolios is probably still a bit lenient due to the experimental nature of the course and that the instructions for these parts of the course need to made clearer to the students. In particular, students will need more guidance for the individual book review because too many of them treated it more like a summary and demonstrated less critical thinking than was hoped. Also, some students were unclear of what was exactly expected of them for the student portfolio, so additional examples of previous portfolios will be given in future sections of this course. Appropriate adjustments are being made to the assignments and exams to improve the course, especially in light of its future designation as a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Communication | Economics Basic Theories
- Measure: Student Portfolio in ECON 4999 | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Communication | Economics Basic Theories
- Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Benefits and costs | Economics Basic Theories

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The results of the tracking exams indicate that students performed better in this past year than in the previous year on both the MicroTE and MacroTEs. Those students assessed in ECON 4999 appear to be doing quite well demonstrating competence in most of the undergraduate learning outcomes as all targets were met. In line with the action plan from last year, readings in the ECON 4999 course that were too technical were replaced with more appropriate readings. 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). In addition, the additional resources needed for the ECON 4999 course as enrollment goes up are gradually being provided, particularly in light of its new designation as a CTW course.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The primary change needed is in refining the ECON 4999 course, especially as it becomes a newly-designated CTW course. 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.
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 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

**O/O 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)**

To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

**O/O 2: Economic Disciplines (M: 1, 2)**

To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

**O/O 3: Economic Data (M: 2)**

To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Core Examination (O: 1, 2)

All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**

Target not set this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 19 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 14 Bs, 2 Cs. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Analytics, Definition, and Mathematics with a mean score of 3.63, while the strongest factor was Application with a mean score of 4. There were 16 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 11 Bs, and 2 Cs. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest part was Critical Judgement with a mean score of 3.69, while the strongest parts were Definitions and Analytics with a mean score of 4. There were 14 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 6 As, 7 Bs and 1 C. A factor analysis revealed that all factors received a score of 4.36. A comparison with last year’s findings show no significant changes in scores.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines**

Target not set this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 19 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 14 Bs, 2 Cs. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Analytics, Definition, and Mathematics with a mean score of 3.63, while the strongest factor was Application with a mean score of 4. There were 16 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 11 Bs, and 2 Cs. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest part was Critical Judgement with a mean score of 3.69, while the strongest parts were Definitions and Analytics with a mean score of 4. There were 14 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 6 As, 7 Bs and 1 C. A factor analysis revealed that all factors received a score of 4.36. A comparison with last year’s findings show no significant changes in scores.

#### M 2: Essay (O: 2, 3, 4)

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 19 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 14 Bs, 2 Cs. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Analytics, Definition, and Mathematics with a mean score of 3.63, while the strongest factor was Application with a mean score of 4. There were 16 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 3 As, 11 Bs, and 2 Cs. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest part was Critical Judgement with a mean score of 3.69, while the strongest parts were Definitions and Analytics with a mean score of 4. There were 14 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2007-2008, with 6 As, 7 Bs and 1 C. A factor analysis revealed that all factors received a score of 4.36. A comparison with last year’s findings show no significant changes in scores.
All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines**
Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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, 4.05 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.89 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 3.94 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.13 for Econometric Skills, 4.13 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**
Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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, 4.05 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.89 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 3.94 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.13 for Econometric Skills, 4.13 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 O4: Applying Economic Models**
Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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, 4.05 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.89 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 3.94 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.13 for Econometric Skills, 4.13 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.

**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**
Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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 alumn mentioned practical framework as the main skill. For the question about which skills or topics should be more emphasized, one alumn listed theoretical and practical framework. The other alumn did not respond to both questions.

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

**Strengthen Math in Core Courses**
Since the lowest scores in both macro and micro exams is Mathematics, instructors of these courses should strive to strengthen this area.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Core Examination
  - Outcome/Objective: 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
analytical skills

Analytical skills need to be strengthened. Instructors of these courses should strive to strengthen this area.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Core Examination | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills

Implementation Description: Summer 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics

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 (89% for Macroeconomics, 88% for Microeconomics, and 93% for Econometrics). It should be noted that the percentage of passing for micro decreased slightly compared with the previous year (92%), while for both macro and econometrics the percentages increased compared with the previous year (53% for macro and 87% for econometrics). Mathematics continues to be a main concern for Macroeconomics. It should be noted that, both Definition and Analytics emerge as weakest parts for Macroeconomics. The main concerns for Microeconomics were Analytics, and Definition, while Econometrics scored evenly on all factors. Compared to the previous year, students improved significantly in the Macroeconomics exam. Improved in math for the Micro exam is slight. It emerges that students had difficulty in Definition and Analytics for both Macro and Micro exams. Note that, in the previous year, the strongest areas were Analytics (in Macroeconomics), Application (in Econometrics), and Definitions (in Microeconomics). These shifts of strongest areas reflect, in part, on the instructors' taking actions on weakest areas identified last year. 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): 3.79 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.05 for Comprehension of the Literature, 3.89 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 3.94 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.13 for Econometric Skills, 4.13 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 are on par with the previous year, and they also indicate that learning outcomes #2, #3, and #4 were met fairly satisfactorily. Started last year, the assessments of students were based on their final exams in the three core courses, Macroeconomics, Microeconomics, and Econometrics. According to alumni, practical framework 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 continuously strengthened in the three core courses, especially in macroeconomics. Two emerging areas that need attention are Definition and Analytics. These should go to improving outcomes in learning objectives #1 and #2. In responding to Alumni survey, the department created a new course that would be the second econometrics course taken by students in the program. The course is a required one and is very popular with students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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(Up to 12/12/2016 01:12 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the "[t]he overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation's premiere research universities located in an urban setting". As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School "...intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007": The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods (M: 1, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Field specialization (M: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To demonstrate mastery of the issues, theories and latest advances in one of the sub-fields of economics offered by the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Conducting Independent Research (M: 3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Analytical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target not set in this cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen students took the Macro comprehensive exam in June 2008. The breakdown in grades is as follows: 5 students received a &quot;Low Pass&quot;; 1 student received a &quot;Pass&quot;; 6 students received a &quot;High Fail&quot;; and 1 student received a &quot;Fail&quot;. While the average passing grades were somewhat lower than last year’s, the committee generally regarded those passing exams as about the same as those from last year. In addition, give the pattern from previous years, the committee expects that those that failed will raise their performance significantly in their next attempt in January. In the Microeconomics exam offered in August 2007, 7 out of 12 students passed the exam (earned at least a &quot;Low Pass&quot;). Passing grades in all categories were comparable to those of previous years. The remaining 5 students failed the exam. However, 4 of these 5 attempted the exam again in January 2008 and passed it. There was a notable improvement in every category with an average increase from 1.8 to 3.25 (out of a possible 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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, this would be taken after the second year in the program. |
| **Target for O3: Field specialization** |
| Target not set in this cycle. |
| **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met** |
| Thirteen students took the Macro comprehensive exam in June 2008. The breakdown in grades is as follows: 5 students received a "Low Pass"; 1 student received a "Pass"; 6 students received a "High Fail"; and 1 student received a "Fail". While the average passing grades were somewhat lower than last year’s, the committee generally regarded those passing exams as about the same as those from last year. In addition, give the pattern from previous years, the committee expects that those that failed will raise their performance significantly in their next attempt in January. In the Microeconomics exam offered in August 2007, 7 out of 12 students passed the exam (earned at least a "Low Pass"). Passing grades in all categories were comparable to those of previous years. The remaining 5 students failed the exam. However, 4 of these 5 attempted the exam again in January 2008 and passed it. There was a notable improvement in every category with an average increase from 1.8 to 3.25 (out of a possible 5). |

| M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 4) |
| After completion of the program’s coursework, students will write a Dissertation. The dissertation is written with close supervision of a faculty dissertation chair and a dissertation committee. The Dissertation will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on). |

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The Public Finance comp was given in June 2008 to 5 students. Four of them passed and one of them failed. The averages per category were virtually the same as those for last year’s group. The Labor comp exam was offered in June 2008, all three students that took the exam obtained a Low Pass. The Environmental comp exam was also offered in June 2008. Two of three students passed the exam. The students that passed showed higher averages than those passing last year. The Experimental field exam was given for the first time in June 2008. Two students earned a Pass and two other a Low-Pass. No students failed. |
Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Since Summer 2007, 15 dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in several categories were slightly below than last year’s group. Nevertheless, the average contribution was still 4.26 out of 5, which is quite high. In addition, in 6 cases, the dissertation committee judged the work would deserve publication in the top journal of the particular field.

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Since Summer 2007, 15 dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in several categories were slightly below than last year’s group. Nevertheless, the average contribution was still 4.26 out of 5, which is quite high. In addition, in 6 cases, the dissertation committee judged the work would deserve publication in the top journal of the particular field.

M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)

Graduates of this program will be asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributes to their performance in their current job. This survey will also include questions about whether the dissertation (or parts of the dissertation) has been submitted for publication or already published; the quality of the publication(s) will be used to assess Ph.D. in Economics, Learning Outcome 4. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Two alumni responded to the survey this year. One indicates that the most useful skill gained from the program has been "econometric analysis". The other identifies work as a research assistant and a teaching assistant as the most useful skills gained. Both alumni are employed as Assistant Professors at universities and have teaching and research responsibilities. They appear to be performing quite successfully. On of them has 6 refereed publications in 5 years. The other one has 3 refereed publications and 2 book chapters in 6 years since graduating. Their suggestions for the program can be summarized as follows: a) offering a time-series course in the program (this has already been implemented since the student graduated). b) encourage graduate students to do internships while in the program.

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

Addressing Alumni Suggestions

The alumni survey raises important issues. Alumni recommended that areas such as "practical econometrics", statistical software programming(e.g., Stata, SAS), data skills, and "project evaluation" should receive greater emphasis. They also recommended that theoretical econometrics, theoretical microeconomics, and theoretical macroeconomics be less emphasized. It should be noted that all 4 students that responded work in government or private research institutes and none in academia, so their suggestions may arise from the particular policy needs of their jobs. The graduate committee and the Department faculty will analyze these suggestions during the course of the 2006-2007 year, and propose changes if deemed necessary. In addition, we will try to obtain a larger sample of survey responses to get a broader picture of the assessment of the program by alumni.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

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

Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee

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 stengths 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
Revise data management topics in econometrics seq.
The data management topics are now placed in the last course of the sequence which is optional. The econometrics committee and graduate committee should analyze the possibility of bringing these topics to an earlier and required course of the sequence. An additional advantage will be the development of these research skills earlier in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Independent Research

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Econometrics Committee; Graduate Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The desired outcomes are generally being met quite well. In terms of learning outcome #1 (“To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics”), the comprehensive exams show that this goal is being achieved very well. These exams also partly address learning outcome #2 (“To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics”). In the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the students who did not pass on the first try and had a second attempt, showed a significant improvement and all passed. 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. In Macroeconomics, 6 of 13 students passed in the first attempt. The passing students performed about as well as those who passed the year before. While there were more students that did not pass the first attempt this year (7 of 13), 6 of these earned a High Fail, so their exams were just below the threshold. Improved performance with an increase in study effort is expected in their second attempt in January 2009.
Every student that failed met with the faculty in the committee to review the exam and learn which areas/topics need to be learned in more depth. Regarding learning outcome #3 (“To demonstrate mastery of the issues, theories and latest advancements in one of the sub-fields of economics offered by the program”), this is being met quite well. Data from the field exams offered during the past year show students are generally performing well and passing these exams without any areas of concern. Regarding learning outcomes #4 (“To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics”) and #2 (described above), these are also clearly being met as indicated by the evaluation of dissertations. Fifteen dissertations were successfully defended during the past year. Concerning the question about the Contribution of the dissertation, the dissertation committees rated 6 of 15 dissertations as likely to be published in a top field journal. The two responses to the Alumni Survey questionnaire received this year gave us a good indication of actual research output about 5 years after graduation. Both alumni are professors at universities. One of them has 6 refereed publications in 5 years. The papers were published in good field journals like Journal of Industrial Economics, Public Finance Review and a general journal, Southern Economic Journal. The other alumnus has 3 refereed publications in international finance field journals and 2 book chapters. Both students also have several papers under review or in progress. It appears that parts of their dissertations were published in at least one refereed journal article. Training good scholars is clearly one of the most important missions of a Ph.D. program. While this year’s number of responses to our survey was only two, both of these alumni have been publishing consistently in refereed outlets, which is the key measure of scholarship. In that regard, learning objective #4 has been well met at least in these cases.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Last year the department changed some of the content of the econometrics sequence including increased coverage of data management topics. This was done in response to concerns from the Alumni Survey from two years ago. This material has been placed in the last and optional econometrics course of the sequence, however. Some students did not sign up for the course this year. The econometrics and graduate committee will explore ways to shift this material to an earlier course (perhaps to the second course in the sequence). Potentially, this course will have a “lab” component covering hands-on data management issues. We also intend to keep refining some of the questionnaires that provide data on the measures to obtain yet more in depth information on how the objectives are being met.

Georgia State University
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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. There were 37 Ph.D. students in...
Special Education during the 07-08 year; five of the students were PULSE students, and four 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Develop content expertise (M: 4)**

Develop content expertise in special education.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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 2007-2008 - 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 07-08 year include the following: 18 articles were submitted by 14 students (with students being the senior author on 5 of these articles); 12 articles were published by 7 students (with students being the senior author on 3 articles); 8 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 5 students; and 4 grants were prepared with the assistance of 3 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 2007-2008 - 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 07-08 year include the following: 18 student assisted in teaching 53 courses; 14 students taught 24 courses at GTAs; 17 students gave 43 guest lectures; and 11 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral students made at least one conference or workshop presentation by candidacy. Other evaluation in this area of the 07-08 year includes the following: 19 students made 26 national conference presentations; 11 students made 13 state conference presentations; 15 students made 57 workshops presentations; and 2 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In the 07-08 academic year, there were 37 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development | **Outcome/Objective:** Engage in professional development

**Implementation Description:** April 2007. Residency requirements have been revised and more accurately reflect department requirements.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Kathy Heller

#### Exit interviews

Evaluate use of exit interviews as a program indicator.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **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:** Engage 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. Exit interviews process and form have been developed with good results so far.

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development | **Outcome/Objective:** Engage in professional development

**Implementation Description:** April 08. Database revisions have occurred and is provided excellent information.

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
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: Finished
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: April 08. Database is now in place to see current and recent graduates.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller and Post Masters’ Advisory Committee
Additional Resources: Person to work on database

Exit Interview Process
Evaluate exit interview process to determine effectiveness and use as program indicator

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: April 2009. Further changes to exit interview process was discussed and implemented
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller/ PMA Committee

Exit Interviews
Standardize more fully advisors use of exit interviews

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: April 2009. Process has been put in place which is more standardized.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Heller/ PMA Committee

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 reexamine the content of exit interviews and process of performing the exit interviews and evaluate their effectiveness

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Educational Leadership EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

O/O 2: Can apply research to improve schools (M: 4)
Student can apply school-based research to improve school performance.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

O/O 4: Understands urban educational leadership (M: 2)
Student understands current issues and concepts in urban educational leadership.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The last time this course was offered, 88 percent of students received an "A".

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The last time this course was offered, 100 percent of students received an "A".

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The last time this course (or its equivalent) was offered, 100 percent of students received an "A".

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 2007-08 academic year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Report on urban educational issues and concepts | Outcome/Objective: Understands urban educational leadership
Implementation Description: Academic year 2006-07
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
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Advanced Field Experience | Outcome/Objective: Can facilitate programs and reform projects
Implementation Description: Ed.S. program redesign must be completed by 2008
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 2007-08 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: Report on urban educational issues and concepts | Outcome/Objective: Understands urban educational leadership
Implementation Description: Ed.S. program redesign must be completed by 2008
Responsible Person/Group: All members of the Educational Leadership unit

Use of research
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2007-08 academic year. 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: Analytical research project | Outcome/Objective: Can apply research to improve schools
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 targets available to us for the designated time period. This suggests to us that the Ed.S. program is 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 suspended because the implementation of the new program necessitates writing new learning objectives and assessments. This process is proceeding step by step and a complete picture of the new program is still not complete.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Please refer to the above discussion with regard to the program redesign we are engaged in.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Educational Leadership MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Leadership (EL) programs is to educate and prepare school leaders with the capacity to transform schools and improve student learning. This mission focuses on the education and preparation of urban educational leaders with a commitment to social justice and systemic change. The EL degree and certification programs are based on the Educational Leadership Constituent Council’s (ELCC) Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership. The M.Ed. and L-5 Certification Program are based on the “Standards for school building leadership.” Through academic and field-based preparation, candidates in the EL program are prepared to be positive change agents within the rapidly changing contexts of schools. Leaders are prepared to facilitate reflective inquiry on teaching and learning throughout the school. Students enrolled in each program come from highly diverse backgrounds, varied educational backgrounds, and possess multiple needs, interests, and abilities. The EL Program recognizes this diversity and provides opportunities to meet the needs of the individual student. The program seeks to create and structure learning environments so that educational leaders can meaningfully incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge structures. This is accomplished through an active, social and authentic learning process. Student input is not only encouraged but also required in the courses and field experiences. Teaching and learning strategies are guided by current research, community need, and the diversity of the students. The EL Program believes that teaching and learning occurs through a process incorporating reflection, inquiry, and action within the context of practice. Consequently, the cohort leadership program has been designed to align course work with actual leadership practice. This facilitates students’ ability to integrate abstract theoretical knowledge with practice, which gives students the opportunity to directly engage in practice as informed, analytical, and critical learners.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Can apply leadership theory in practice (M: 1)
Student is able to apply general theories of leadership to practice

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 5. 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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

SLO 2: Can design and implement action research (M: 2)
Student can apply the tools of action research to improve school performance

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

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 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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2.23 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.22 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 4: Can provide leadership for urban education (M: 4)
Student is able to lead an effective urban school

Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by 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 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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Evaluations in key courses (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O1: Can apply leadership theory in practice**

70 percent of all students earning an "A" in all of these courses combined and in each individual course.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPEL 7000</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Ave: 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEL 7330</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEL 7410</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSF 7450</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEL 7500</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEL 7510</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Action Research Leadership Project (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 problem, and develop and implement an action research proposal. Regardless of the project topic, these tasks require knowledge and skills in organizational management. The following ELCC Standards have been identified as commonly assessed through the action research project rubric: 1.Statement of the problem (ELCC standard 1.1) 2.Review of literature (ELCC standard 6.1) 3.Data sources (ELCC standard 3, all) 4.Data analysis (ELCC standard 3, all) 5.Data interpretations, conclusions, implications (ELCC standard 3 all) 6.Quality of writing and presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Can design and implement action research**

Seventy percent of all students receiving a "target" rating with no less than five percent of students receiving an "unacceptable" rating.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Statement</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Professional Leadership Portfolio (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A primary assessment for the year-long practicum in the M.Ed. and ND (L-5 Add-On) programs in educational leadership is the portfolio. The practicum is designed to provide opportunities for candidates to apply their knowledge and skills in all six of the ELCC standards. A strength of the practicum is that it allows candidates a high degree of flexibility in structuring their own activities and assessments based on the needs of their internship site, the needs of the on-site mentor, and the needs of the candidates. Candidates are required to complete a range of tasks and assessments that demonstrate knowledge and skills in each of the GLSII'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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Can perform as change agent in schools**

Seventy percent of all students receiving a "target" rating with no less than five percent of students receiving an "unacceptable" rating.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module:</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log:</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: STARS Survey (individual mean scores) (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The STARS Student Survey in Educational Leadership was developed to assess candidates' professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in all six ELCC Standards. The survey contains five questions for each of the six standards; two are designed to measure professional knowledge and three are designed to measure professional skills. There are ten questions designed to measure student professional dispositions. Professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to effectively lead an urban school. Students complete the survey at the end of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Can provide leadership for urban education**

70% of students rating themselves At or Above the Expected level of "4 - Proficient" at program completion accros all standards and in each standard.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>86% Standard 2</th>
<th>85% Standard 3</th>
<th>76% Standard 4</th>
<th>85% Standard 5</th>
<th>94% Average:85%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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 action research proposal and the total of 66% across all measures is much too low. The program desires to have all of its candidates achieve target performance in
the action research project. This requires that candidates design an action research study that will support student learning and development. We interpret these results as an indication of the need for improvement in our ability to prepare candidates to identify a problem and to select the research tools needed to assess and understand the problem, access, interpret and apply existing research/scholarship in the problem, and design a high-quality action research study that will provide the necessary data to address the problem. In response to this need, the EPEL faculty will redesign the Action Research Project. Because of the limited time available in the program (9 months), the Action Research Project will be changed to focus on identification and articulation of a problem, conceptualizing the problem in the context of a specific school organization, conducting a quality review of literature related to the problem, and developing a solid action research proposal.

<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Research Leadership Project</td>
<td>Can design and implement action research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>October 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>The educational leadership unit faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations in key courses</td>
<td>Can apply leadership theory in practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Academic Year 2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>EPEL Unit Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Leadership Portfolio</td>
<td>Can perform as change agent in schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>October 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>EPEL Unit Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 specifically linked to course knowledge to the practicum experience. Specifically, students will be provided more opportunities to demonstrate performance of course knowledge in the practicum.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STARS Survey (individual mean scores)</td>
<td>Can provide leadership for urban education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>Academic Year 2006-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>EPEL Unit Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
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.

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.

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.

action research

The data indicate that students can perform action research at an acceptable rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit has redesigned the master’s program to ensure higher levels of effectiveness and understanding in action research by focusing more on the data analysis and action research in the two practicum courses. The in-school performances have been shifted to the courses to allow for more attention in the practicum courses on data analysis and action research.
**Additional Resources:** greater collaboration with research faculty

**change agents in schools**
The data indicate that students can be effective change agents at an acceptably high rate. With the redesign of the master’s program, students will have even more opportunity to serve as leaders through common essential performance assessments and through a new emphasis on issues of diversity in schools and communities.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** STARS Survey (individual mean scores)
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can provide leadership for urban education

**Implementation Description:** new program begins August 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** entire educational leadership unit

**leadership theory in schools**
The data indicate that students can apply leadership knowledge at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit has just undergone a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. With this change, we have significantly altered the master’s program to embed performance based assessments and practicum experiences in each class. We feel this is the best way to integrate theory and practice.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Evaluations in key courses
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply leadership theory in practice

**Implementation Description:** new program begins August 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** All leadership faculty

**Additional Resources:** coordination support

---

**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. Nevertheless, the unit identified ways in which they could make the experiences more educative: embedding performances and shared experiences in each class and offering more guidance in data analysis and action research. As a result, the unit incorporated these elements into the redesign of the new program.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The unit now needs to focus on implementation of the new program to ensure that the goals identified in the planning process are implemented as effectively as possible. They also need to redesign assessments for next year to ensure that the program evaluation matches the new program.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Executive Summary**
The educational leadership unit has redesigned its master’s program to not only comply with new expectations from the Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission, but also to ensure an even more educative experience and greater links between theory and practice for students.

**Contributions to the Institution**
The new master’s program supports the institution by striving to improve communities by virtue of the leaders we prepare.

**Highlights**
The primary changes in the new program include new performance based assessments, embedding school experiences in the classes, and offering greater guidance with the data analysis and action research.

**Challenges**
Organizational structure of the department and traditional roles of faculty pose the greatest challenges for implementing the new program.

**Teaching Activities**
Professors will be rethinking the delivery of their classes to support the performance based elements of the classes. Further, on-line instruction will be used for the data analysis and action research courses.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**
The unit hopes to focus more on research on leadership preparation both by evaluating our own program as well as examining the revised programs of others in the state.

**Public/Community Service**
With a new emphasis in diversity and community leadership, the leadership unit anticipates more opportunities to support the local community.

---

**Georgia State University**
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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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 met 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 meet or exceed expectations, as evaluated by program faculty in EPRS 8500 & 8530, and EPS 9260 & 9270.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

93 students met or exceeded the outcomes in assignments that critically evaluate literature and review articles.

M 2: Research Track/Prospectus & Dissertations Defense (O: 3)

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 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 passed their prospectus or dissertation defense on the first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 students passed their prospectus defense and 15 students passed their dissertation defense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: Interprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts**
95% of students meet or exceed expectations, as evaluated by program faculty in the COE doctoral core courses of EPSF 8270, 8280, 8310, 8320, 8340 or 9260.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 students met or exceeded outcomes based upon the following assignments: philosophy and epistemology positions, issues papers, book reviews, and literature reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: Interprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts
- **Implementation Description:** May, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPS Program Coordinators

#### Capstone Revision
We will redesign the capstone course to match departmental learning outcomes and objectives, and create a rubric for evaluation of scholarly writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research Core Requirements/Cohort Policy Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Critically Evaluates Literature
Syllabi Revisions
Ensure that the syllabi for courses identified in the research & social foundations core as well as the doctoral cohort policy sequence are aligned with the LOA outcomes/objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Research Track/Prospectus & Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Conducts Scholarly Research
- Measure: Social Foundations Core Requirements | Outcome/Objective: Intreprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts

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 three named outcomes and objectives. However, the feedback we have received from dissertation advisors suggests that there is a noticeable weakness in literature reviews and analysis of data. The end-of-program capstone course was established for students to gain expertise in writing scholarly literature reviews as well as dissertation chapters, particularly in methodology. There appears to be a need for revisions to that course or an additional seminar/workshop devoted to preparation of the dissertation at a stage earlier in the doctoral program. Additionally, we will work toward strengthening our doctoral admissions process, as well as limit the number of advisees assigned to graduate faculty. We will monitor adequate student progress to make sure that they are on the path to matriculate in a timely fashion. We will redesign LOAs as indicated to learn more specifically what students lack in academic preparation for their program completions. This may indicate that further changes need to be made in classes leading up to the capstone as well.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
See the above discussion with regard to program and LOA redesign.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Educational Psychology MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the 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 36 students in the MS program. There were 5 graduates during the 2007-2008 academic year (Summer 2007 through Spring 2008). Additionally, four students are expected to complete the program by the end of summer semester, 2008.

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In both the project and thesis tracks, students are evaluated in terms of their expertise with concepts in their specific area. With the thesis track, students are also evaluated in terms of their appropriate use of research methodology, and their competence with data analysis and reporting. During the past academic year 100% (n=5) students successfully demonstrated these skills and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In both the project and thesis tracks, students are evaluated in terms of their expertise with concepts in their specific area. With the thesis track, students are also evaluated in terms of their appropriate use of research methodology, and their competence with data analysis and reporting. During the past academic year 100% (n=5) students successfully demonstrated these skills and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In both the project and thesis tracks, students are evaluated in terms of their expertise with concepts in their specific area. With the thesis track, students are also evaluated in terms of their appropriate use of research methodology, and their competence with data analysis and reporting. During the past academic year 100% (n=5) students successfully demonstrated these skills and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

### 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 2007-2008 - 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

**Clarify 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

**Clarify requirements for masters thesis research.**
The Master’s Handbook in Educational Psychology has been revised to more clearly indicate expectations for a successful thesis. This discussion will be on going in the coming academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Comprehensive examination
  - | Outcome/Objective: Apply research methods
  - | Participates in scholarly activities

- **Implementation Description:** On going
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty members in Educational Psychology

**Expand Orientation for Masters students**
For fall 2008 we have an evening devoted exclusively to an orientation for new masters students. This will give new students an opportunity to meet each other and the faculty. It will also present specifics of the program and give students an opportunity to voice any questions or concerns. It is anticipated that this effort will assist in meeting all program objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Comprehensive examination
  - | Outcome/Objective: Apply research methods
  - | Displays expertise with major concepts
  - | Participates in scholarly activities

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **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?
Two MS tracks are in place, a project track and a thesis track. Data indicate that students in both tracks are doing well. When Summer 2008 is considered along with Academic 2007-2008 year data, there will be 9 graduates in the MS program. This is higher than the 6 graduates reported in the program for 2005-2006 and about the same as the 10 reported for the 2006-2007 academic year. More attention has been given to recruiting of new MS students. This has begun to show some effect as 14 new MS students are expected to attend the new student orientation to be held at the beginning of fall semester.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Student Handbook is undergoing revision to more clearly indicate expectations for thesis research. More attention will continue to be given to recruiting of new MS students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Educational Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Doctoral level prepares students for careers in teaching in schools, colleges, and universities; as researchers in state and city departments of education; and professionals in training research programs in government and industry. There are 43 students in the Ph.D. program. There was 1 graduate during the 2007-2008 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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Annual Evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

This review includes all students who have not completed the comprehensive examination. The evaluation of each student includes a review of academic progress, residency progress, professional growth, and professionalism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Demonstrates competence in teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will be given a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met

- All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better on the annual evaluation.

#### M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

All students must defend a dissertation proposal based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

- During the past year, 5 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

- During the past year, 5 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
During the past year, 5 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology**
All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
During the past year, 5 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities**
All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
During the past year, 5 students successfully defended their dissertation proposal.

**M 3: Teaching Internship (O: 6)**
The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.

**Target for O6: Demonstrates competence in teaching**
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
During the 2007-2008 academic year, all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

**M 4: Professional Development Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
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.

**Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts**
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

**Target for O2: Understands and applies Research Methods**
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

**Target for O3: Can communicate Professionally**
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

**Target for O4: Values underpinning Educational Psychology**
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

**Target for O5: Participates in scholarly activities**
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

**M 5: Professional Communication (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
All students in EPY are expected to present papers at professional organizations and publish in professional journals.

**Target for O1: Displays expertise with concepts**
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
During the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 25 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by doctoral students in the Educational Psychology program.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
During the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 25 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by doctoral students in the Educational Psychology program.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
During the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 25 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by doctoral students in the Educational Psychology program.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
During the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 25 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by doctoral students in the Educational Psychology program.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
During the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 25 publications, presentations, and grant proposals were authored or co-authored by doctoral students in the Educational Psychology program.

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

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: 2007-2008
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 Research Methods
  - Values underpinning Educational Psychology

**Implementation Description:** Annually

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

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

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

Program faculty will continue to carefully monitor students' performance during the year.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Educational Research MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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, 6)**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</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>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</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>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</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>

**O/O 4: Design a research study (M: 1, 4, 6)**
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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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.

Target for O4: Design a research study
100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

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.

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.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In 2007, two students successfully completed the master’s project and graduated with their M.S. in Educational Research. Both of them wrote the equivalent of a proposal for a master’s thesis, having written a review of the literature on their topic and proposed a design for addressing their respective research queries.

Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In 2007, two students successfully completed the master’s project and graduated with their M.S. in Educational Research. Both of them wrote the equivalent of a proposal for a master’s thesis, having written a review of the literature on their topic and proposed a design for addressing their respective research queries.

Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In 2007, two students successfully completed the master’s project and graduated with their M.S. in Educational Research. Both of them wrote the equivalent of a proposal for a master’s thesis, having written a review of the literature on their topic...
and proposed a design for addressing their respective research queries.

**Target for O4: Design a research study**

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In 2007, two students successfully completed the master’s project and graduated with their M.S. in Educational Research. Both of them wrote the equivalent of a proposal for a master’s thesis, having written a review of the literature on their topic and proposed a design for addressing their respective research queries.

**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.

**Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**M 6: Other assessments relevant to learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Although Measures 1-5 are useful for evaluating the learning outcomes, other course assessments may also apply, such as shorter descriptions of data collection procedures, brief write-ups of the findings from data analysis, etc.

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Both students on whom data were provided regarding relevant in-class assessments and projects/homework assignments met the standards for Objectives 1-4.

**Target for O2: Analyze data and report on the results**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Both students on whom data were provided regarding relevant in-class assessments and projects/homework assignments met the standards for Objectives 1-4.

**Target for O3: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Both students on whom data were provided regarding relevant in-class assessments and projects/homework assignments met the standards for Objectives 1-4.

**Target for O4: Design a research study**

100% of students earn the equivalent of an "A" on the assessment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Both students on whom data were provided regarding relevant in-class assessments and projects/homework assignments met the standards for Objectives 1-4.

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

**Incorporate LOA-relevant assessments into courses**

A change in leadership and turn over of faculty has resulted in new faculty assuming the responsibility for LOAs. The unit is in the process of redefining the mission and goals and learning outcomes and creating measures for the purpose of evaluating the program.

- **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
  - Measure: Review and critique the research literature
Improve data collection procedure

Collect and report on data from Fall `06 PTIs/GTAs

Mentor master’s students to/through project/thesis

Improve data collection procedure

Review the list of objectives and measures
**Improve tracking of students for data collection**

We had only five students who were in our master’s program for all three academic terms in 2007 (Spring, Summer, and Fall). We admitted a few during 2007 and a few more during 2008, so our numbers are back up. Beginning in Fall 2008 (retroactively for students who were enrolled prior to Fall 2008), we will ensure that master’s students and their advisors are in close enough communication that we can track the courses that all of our master’s students are taking each academic term. It could be the case that the paucity of data for ’07 was due to the paucity of students, in which case we will incidentally have more data for 2008. It could, however, be that the master’s students we have are either not persistently enrolled in coursework or are somehow taking very few EPRS courses. Keeping closer track of what our students are taking is good advising practice anyway, but that information will also be useful to have if we again end up with very little LOA data for 2008, because we will know the number and type of courses that our students are taking. That will tell us whether: A. The students are taking a sufficient number of EPRS courses, with 2006 and 2007 just being years with low numbers of students; B. The students are taking a reasonable number of courses but are taking very few EPRS courses; or C. The students are just not taking many courses. The RMS coordinator has a list of the master’s students currently in the program and their advisors, so the advisors will be contacted soon about gathering information on their advisees’ course schedules.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Implementation Description:** August 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The RMS faculty who have master’s advisees

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

What little data we have suggests that students in the master’s program are achieving the learning objectives we have set out, but we have insufficient data to state broadly with a reasonable degree of confidence that students in our program are meeting the objectives.

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

We will need to do a better job of knowing the courses in which our students are enrolled. Different than in 2006, for the LOA data collection for 2007, all instructors, whether full-time faculty or not, were contacted for collecting LOA data, but there were so few students to go around that we did not get much data.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 English Assessment of Core**  
**As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST**  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**

Core courses in the English Department are often the first point of contact for new students at GSU. Therefore, it is our mission in Lower Division Studies in English to introduce students to the university community and to academia in ways that are not only engaging from the first, but also in ways that help students want to stay at Georgia State, become part of the diverse community here, and contribute to the university community. We aim to provide students, both English majors and non-majors, with the skills in written communication necessary for success in their college courses and beyond.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Written Communication—Core (M: 1)**

Written communication in Lower division English courses (the Core) is a primary focus of our learning outcomes and objectives for students in our classes. In 2007-2008, success in written communication was determined through a rubric that included the following categories: Ideas (topic, thesis, purpose, articulate, original) Organization (structure, coherence, unity, transitions), Development (details, evidence, examples, logic), Audience, Style and Mechanics (sentence structure, word choice, tone), Grammar and Mechanics (usage, spelling, punctuation), and Format (presentation, sources, documentation, MLA Style).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written Communication Assessment (O: 1)**

During fall and spring semesters 2007-08, instructors of English teaching in the Core (1000 and 2000) used a revised rubric in their classes to measure several criteria for written communication (see outcome description). Data for Written Communication was gathered from 25 TA Teaching portfolios (a random selection) which included essays from approximately 650 students taking Composition in the Core. Each TA teaching portfolio included at least three essays rated High, Medium, Low with a rubric that instructors used to analytically score each essay. These essays were representative of what instructors saw in student writing in their classes. The following data is a compilation of the results from the rubric scores of written communication from this academic year.
Target for O1: 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, a score of 6 indicating excellence) on each measure and on the total score.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

The assessment results for the Written Communication learning outcome in the Core in English classes demonstrate written communication skills at three levels: High = total score of 5.4 out of a possible 6; Medium = a total score of 3.8 out of a possible 6; Low = a total score of 2.36 out of a possible score of 6. The total score across all rubrics including high, medium and low essays = a total score of 3.85. More specifically, scores on subscales within the rubric indicate that students skills in Ideas (formulating clear thesis statements, focus, purpose, etc) are good with an average total score of 4.2 Students score the lowest on the subscales of Grammar with a total score of 3.5. However, essays rated in the high range score 5.0 on grammar and those rated low score in the 1.8 range, which explains the mean score across essays. Even though we hoped to have all students score at least a 4 on each subscale and on the total rubric score, it might be more realistic to have a goal of a 5 for the high group, a 4 for the medium group and a 3 for the low group. We will reconsider these ideas and more for next year.

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

Written Communication - Core

The data collected from our new Writing Assessment Rubrics indicates students are doing well with previously low-scoring areas (thesis and structure). However, it appears students are having issues expressing alternative points of view and providing clear support for their claims. These issues, we feel, will improve when the students exit 1102, as that course is designed to teach students how to include oppositional viewpoints and evidence.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Written Communication Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication--Core

Implementation Description: Spring, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Angela Hall-Godsey, LDS program

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Because we used a high, medium, low system for reviewing written communication skills, our totals and subscales look different from last year’s when we looked only at totals across the courses. However, we did not get numbers for how many students in each class represent each of the three categories, so it’s hard to tell what the comparison to last year really is. We are making progress in terms of paying attention to what students have learned when they produce writing in each of the three categories, but we still need to gather more information so that the total scores reflect more accurately the numbers of students who write in each category. That way our total scores will have more meaning.

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

Compared to last year’s results, the data on Written Communication in the Core indicates that we are improving in the area of Format (teaching MLA style and documentation). There were many more scores of 3 and 4 in the medium and low range than we expected. However, we must continue to work on grammar and mechanics as well as development as the range of scores in those areas did not change much from last year (except in the high samples). We will continue work on the rubric and on ways to gather data that most closely reveals what our students are actually doing - what skills they are actually presenting.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 English BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
( Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs. We serve students at every level in the university with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities, including study abroad, internships, tutoring, and research assistantships.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Practice (M: 4, 8)**

(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will demonstrate a range of rhetorical practices and genres, including but not limited to: layout, markup, chunking, textual editing, ethnography, newsletters, annotated bibliographies, brochures, blogs, FAQs, grants, manuals, memos of various kinds, proposals, reports, research papers, surveys, user documentation, web & various media, white papers.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 4: Knowledge of literary terms (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 5: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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
2 Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 6: Knowledge of criticism and theory (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 7: Ability to comprehend texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 8: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
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
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Ability to create effective written communications (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
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
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 10: Ability to engage in effective oral communication (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)**
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**
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 11: Ability to use research effectively (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**
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**
4 Critical Thinking
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 12: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8)**
Students will be able to engage with contemporary issues that emerge from the study of literature and of writing and to explore contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions that arise from English studies.
# General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

## Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

## Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 13: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching (M: 2, 3)
*(for students in Secondary English Concentration)* Students will demonstrate a solid foundation in knowledge needed for middle or secondary English instruction: American, British, and World literature; language and grammar; and composition theory and practice.

Relevant Associations: This outcome is designed to prepare students for the TEEMS program or another graduate professional program in English education.

## Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

## Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 14: 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.

## Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

## Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 15: 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.

## General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

## Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

## Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 16: Applying literary studies to creative writing (M: 6, 7)
*(for students in the Creative Writing concentration)* Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works and will develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry or fiction, depending upon the student’s choice of genre.

## General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

## Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

## Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 17: Ability to produce effective literary works (M: 6, 7)
*(for students in the Creative Writing Concentration)* Students will be able to use a variety of techniques to create effective fiction or poetry that is authentic and engaging and grammatically and syntactically correct.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 18: Ability to revise literary works effectively (M: 6, 7)
(for students in the Creative Writing concentration) Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism and will be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor to revise their own creative works.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 19: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: History (M: 4, 8)
(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era and central characteristics of rhetoric in various time periods and places (including pre-classical Greece, classical Greece, the Roman Republic, Imperial Rome, Medieval Europe, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, America in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries).

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 20: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Theory (M: 4, 8)
(for students in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration) Students will demonstrate knowledge of representative rhetorical theorists from a wide range of periods, covering a diverse set of perspectives. Theorists include traditional figures from western rhetoric (such as Aristotle, Plato, Isocrates, Cicero, Quintillian, Augustine, de Pisan, ramus, Vico, Campbell, Whatley, Blair, Bakhtin, Perelman, Toulmin, Foucault, Kristeva, Burke, Weaver); contemporary theorists in composition and pedagogy, professional writing, digital rhetoric, and new media; and emerging scholarship on non-western rhetoric.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M1: Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)
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
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section’s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of “effective communication skills.”

Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section’s
scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O4**: Knowledge of literary terms
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O5**: Knowledge of language and linguistics
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O6**: Knowledge of criticism and theory
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O7**: Ability to comprehend texts
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O8**: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O9**: Ability to create effective written communications
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O10**: Ability to engage in effective oral communication
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O11**: Ability to use research effectively
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section`s scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

Target for **O12**: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues
There were no targets set for this assessment measure in the last report.
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the senior seminar results for this concentration were all above a mean average of 4.0, but one section showed significantly poorer results with mean averages in the 3.0 - 3.6 range. Even despite this section's scores, there was a dramatic increase of .4 in the area of "effective communication skills."

**M2: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)**

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 use the Assessment Coordinator to analyze data from the previous year 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**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning "knowledge of language and linguistics" since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year's scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "effective communication skills." Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated "can't determine" when responding to the criterion addressing "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues."

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning "knowledge of language and linguistics" since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year's scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "effective communication skills." Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated "can't determine" when responding to the criterion addressing "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues."

**Target for O4: Knowledge of literary terms**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning "knowledge of language and linguistics" since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year's scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "effective communication skills." Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated "can't determine" when responding to the criterion addressing "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues."

**Target for O5: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning "knowledge of language and linguistics" since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year's scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "effective communication skills." Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated "can't determine" when responding to the criterion addressing "knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues."

**Target for O6: Knowledge of criticism and theory**
Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

### Target for O7: Ability to comprehend texts

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

### Target for O8: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

### Target for O9: Ability to create effective written communications

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

### Target for O10: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

### Target for O11: Ability to use research effectively

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

**Target for O12: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

**Target for O13: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

**Target for O14: Knowledge of English Education profession**

Previous targets called for a review of the criterion concerning “knowledge of language and linguistics” since this criterion caused confusion in past assessment cycles. (Readers have been uncertain about how to score this category when portfolios do not include work that specifically addresses issues of language and linguistics.) The Secondary English committee took up this question, but it has yet come up with a solution that would clarify the expectations of this criterion.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio assessment data for Secondary English show a decrease of between .1 to .6 in all categories of the departmental and student assessment forms, when compared to last year’s scores. Even worse, these scores are either equal to or lower than the lowest scores from the past four years of assessment data. The two criterion that received less than a 4.0 in 2007-2008 were “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “effective communication skills.” Another problem was that portfolio reviewers often indicated “can’t determine” when responding to the criterion addressing “knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues.”

**M 3: Senior Seminar in Secondary English (O: 1, 2, 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**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.
year's scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can't determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of literary terms**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year's scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can't determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can’t determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O6: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can’t determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O7: Ability to comprehend texts**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can’t determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O8: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can’t determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O9: Ability to create effective written communications**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include "ability to engage with global issues," "knowledge of pedagogical theory," and "ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project." In addition, in two categories ("knowledge of language and linguistics" and "ability to engage with global issues") the number of "can’t determine" scores almost equaled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O10: Ability to engage in effective oral communication**
No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O11: Ability to use research effectively**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O12: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O13: Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O14: Knowledge of English Education profession**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**Target for O15: Ability to teach effectively**

No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from the senior seminar in this concentration also decreased from last year’s scores in fourteen out of seventeen categories (with decreases ranging from .1 to 1.2 points. Areas with the lowest scores include “ability to engage with global issues,” “knowledge of pedagogical theory,” and “ability to conduct advanced research and to complete a substantial project.” In addition, in two categories (“knowledge of language and linguistics” and “ability to engage with global issues”) the number of “can’t determine” scores almost equalled all the other scores put together.

**M 4: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20)**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of literary terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of language and linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Knowledge of criticism and theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to comprehend texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to think critically and to interpret texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Ability to create effective written communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."
were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**Target for O10: Ability to engage in effective oral communication**

No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**Target for O11: Ability to use research effectively**

No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**Target for O12: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues**

No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**Target for O19: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: History**

No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**Target for O20: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Theory**

No specific targets were set for this assessment measure last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the scores for this senior seminar all fell in the 4.2 - 4.6 range. The two lowest scores were in the areas of "knowledge of rhetorical practices and genres" and "ability to produce writing for a range of audiences and purposes."

**M 5: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12)**

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**

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.
Target for **O4**: Knowledge of literary terms

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O5**: Knowledge of language and linguistics

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O6**: Knowledge of criticism and theory

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O7**: Ability to comprehend texts

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O8**: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O9**: Ability to create effective written communications

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O11**: Ability to use research effectively

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

Target for **O12**: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

There was no target set for this assessment measure in the previous report.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

As the hyperlink information indicates, the results for the Literature portfolios are in the 4.1 - 4.7 range with only a maximum of .2 variance with the scores from last year. In addition, they reflect consistency over the past three years, indicating that students have generally met the outcomes specific to their concentration.

**M 6: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18)**

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 courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year's results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**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 courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year's results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of literary terms**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year's results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year's results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for O6: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year's results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for O7: Ability to comprehend texts**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.
Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for Q8: 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 courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for Q9: Ability to create effective written communications**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for Q11: Ability to use research effectively**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for Q16: Applying literary studies to creative writing**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**Target for Q17: Ability to produce effective literary works**

Last year's action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of "evidence of significant revision" and "evidence of a variety of effective techniques." A number of categories received between one and five "can’t determine" scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.
to judge their work.

**Target for O18: Ability to revise literary works effectively**

Last year’s action plan discussed the ongoing need to decrease class sizes in the creative writing courses, 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 target has not been met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results on the student and department assessment forms for this concentration were generally the same as last year’s results, with only slight variations of .1 or .2. This suggests consistency in the Creative Writing program. The lowest scores were in the areas of “evidence of significant revision” and “evidence of a variety of effective techniques.” A number of categories received between one and five “can’t determine” scores, indicating that there may be some discrepancy between what students are required to submit in the portfolio and what criteria the faculty are using to judge their work.

**M 7: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18)**

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**

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”

**Target for O4: Knowledge of literary terms**

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”

**Target for O5: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”

**Target for O6: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”
Target for **O7**: Ability to comprehend texts

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O8**: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O9**: Ability to create effective written communications

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O10**: Ability to engage in effective oral communication

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O11**: Ability to use research effectively

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O16**: Applying literary studies to creative writing

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O17**: Ability to produce effective literary works

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing."

---

Target for **O18**: Ability to revise literary works effectively

There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.
There were no particular targets that were set for this assessment measure in the 2006-2007 report.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the results from this year’s senior seminar assessments were generally good; all categories had scores in the 4.2 - 4.4 range. There was a sizeable drop in five categories when compared with last year’s scores, and yet this year’s scores were consistent with those of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The two weakest criteria for this year and for the four-year range tend to be in the areas of “original, authentic, and engaging writing” and “grammatically/syntactically sound writing.”

**M 8: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 19, 20)**

Historically, the portfolio assessment procedures for the Rhetoric and Composition (R & C) concentration developed at a different rate from the other concentrations. Faculty members in this concentration began using electronic portfolios of student work for program assessment as early as 2001, and from 2001-2005 they made specific curricular changes based upon the general trends displayed in the portfolios. Starting in summer 2005, this concentration began to use electronic versions of the assessment forms to track the specific results of the student portfolios.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of major figures/genres in literature**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of periods/movements in literary history**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Practice**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of literary terms**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

**Target for O5: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

**Target for O6: Knowledge of criticism and theory**

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year (“ability to write with various technologies” and “ability to engage with contemporary/global issues”) of .4 or .5 on the mean average.
As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O7: Ability to comprehend texts

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O8: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O9: Ability to create effective written communications

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O11: Ability to use research effectively

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O12: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O19: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: History

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.

### Target for O20: Knowledge of Rhetoric and Writing: Theory

In last year’s assessment report, faculty from this concentration expressed the need to continue discussion about their expectations for writing technologies reflected in the portfolios. The fact that the score for this criterion was among the lowest (with a 4.1 mean average) suggests that these discussions have not yet clarified their expectations in this area.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked information indicate, the portfolio scores were all between a 4.0 and 4-6 range. Two criteria reflect a sizable decrease from last year ("ability to write with various technologies" and "ability to engage with contemporary/global issues") of .4 or .5 on the mean average.
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>September 15, 2006</td>
<td>Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Broader participation in assessment process (R & C)

A greater number of Rhetoric and Composition faculty members will be encouraged to participate in the assessment of the portfolios so that the evaluation is not determined by only a few individuals and so that more faculty can be involved in programmatic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>May 15, 2006</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Composition faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>May 15, 2007</td>
<td>Audrey Goodman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>May 15, 2007</td>
<td>Creative Writing Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
needed for teaching | 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

Implementation Description: May 15, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing faculty

Reconsider research expectations(R & C)
The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will participate in the departmental discussions about research and will meet as a group to consider the implications for their concentration.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to use research effectively

Implementation Description: December 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Reconsider Writing Technologies (R & C)
Rhetoric and Composition will reconsider the criterion that evaluates the Ability to Use a Variety of Writing Strategies in the senior seminar since the course does not provide an opportunity for a demonstration of such a variety. Either the course will be redesigned to teach further technologies or the assessment criteria will be altered to align the assessment criterion to course content more closely.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
- Measure: Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications

Implementation Description: May 15, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Revise portfolio assessment forms (Literature)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Literature concentration are going to 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 each portfolio’s evidence for the ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of language and linguistics

Implementation Description: December 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English Committee

Revise portfolio assessment forms (R & C)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding a criterion assessing the ability to think critically and engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
| Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman (Assessment Coordinator)

Revise Portfolio Forms (Secondary English)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Secondary English Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, clarifying that the effective communication skills are referring to written communications, and adding a criterion that evaluates the ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
| Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise Portfolio Forms (Creative Writing)
The portfolio assessment forms for the Creative Writing Concentration are going to be revised to reflect more of the general education outcomes by adding a criterion evaluating adequate reading interpretation/critical thinking skills.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise senior seminar assessment form (Literature)
The senior seminar form for the Literature concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, distinguishing between written communications skills as one criterion and oral communications/collaboration as another criterion, and adding a criterion addressing students’ ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Literature Concentration | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
| Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts

Implementation Description: September 15, 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Revise senior seminar form (Creative Writing)
The senior seminar form for the Creative Writing Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes by adding a criterion that evaluates reading interpretation/critical thinking skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Senior Seminar in Creative Writing  
*Outcome/Objective:* Ability to think critically and to interpret texts  
**Implementation Description:** September 15, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar form (Literature)**

To avoid confusion, the criterion that assesses "the ability to conduct detailed research and to complete a project that demonstrates the ability to read carefully, think critically, organize coherently, and write effectively" will be changed to read "the ability to read carefully, think critically, organize coherently, and write effectively." In addition, the criterion that assesses "the ability to use information technology effectively" will read "the ability to conduct detailed research and to use information technology effectively."

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Senior Seminar in Literature Concentration  
*Outcome/Objective:* Ability to create effective written communications  
*Ability to use research effectively*  
**Implementation Description:** September 15, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar forms (R & C)**

The senior seminar form for the Rhetoric and Composition concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcome (adding a criterion about oral communications/collaboration and another criterion addressing the ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Senior Seminar in Rhetoric and Composition  
*Outcome/Objective:* Ability to engage in effective oral communication  
*Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues*  
**Implementation Description:** September 15, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Revise senior seminar forms (Secondary English)**

The senior seminar form for the Secondary English Concentration will be revised to incorporate more of the general education outcomes (adding critical thinking skills to the criterion that addresses reading interpretation skills, distinguishing between written communications skills as one criterion and oral communications/collaboration as another criterion, and adding a criterion addressing students’ ability to engage with contemporary issues and/or global questions).

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Senior Seminar in Secondary English  
*Outcome/Objective:* Ability to create effective written communications  
*Ability to engage in effective oral communication | Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues | Ability to think critically and to interpret texts*  
**Implementation Description:** September 15, 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

**Written Communication - Core**

This data indicates that we should address the issues of Development, Style and Mechanics and Format as we continue to encourage students toward sound ideas and organizational structures that are effective for academic writing. However, since most of the percentages split between the B+ and the C range of grades, we might also look at what might describe a B paper and why this category is virtually empty. The Lower Division Studies committee in the Department of English, a standing committee within the department that considers curriculum and assessment for the core courses in English (all 1000 and 2000 level courses) will review these results in the Fall semester, 2006. In addition, a subcommittee of graduate students who teach the composition courses have already looked at these results and are continuing to pilot this rubric as a way to assess student writing. Feedback from both groups will advise the Director of Lower Division Studies, who implements curricular and assessment changes in the English Department.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Marti Singer

**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.
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 Exit 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 periods/movements in literary history
- Measure: Senior Exit 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
- Measure: Senior Exit 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
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | 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
- 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 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 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 (Secondary 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 Exit Portfolios 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
**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):**

- **Implementation Description:** January 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhetoric and Composition faculty

---

**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

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

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies

---

**Delay due date of portfolio (Creative Writing)**

(for the Creative Writing Concentration) Because the creative writing professors require portfolios to be scored at the end of their Senior Seminars, they find it redundant to request Senior Portfolios, due to the department at mid-semester, in addition to those portfolios due at the end of the semester for the Senior Seminar class. They propose allowing the portfolio due for the Senior Seminar to serve the dual purpose of reflecting a creative writing major's best work for a Senior Seminar grade as well as fulfilling the department's portfolio requirement. This change would involve announcing to creative writing students that no portfolio is due from them at the semester midpoint, and professors must collect and score Senior Seminar portfolios early enough at semester's end to allow students to be cleared on time for graduation.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exh 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

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 who 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exh 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
Measure: Senior Exh 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
Measure: Senior Exh 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
Measure: Senior Seminar in Creative Writing | 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
Measure: Senior Seminar 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

Implementation Description: October 2006
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
**Simplify senior seminar forms (Secondary English)**
Faculty members who have taught the senior seminar in this concentration have requested that the assessment sheet be simplified so that there are not so many categories. The current assessment sheet contains 17 criteria and consequently considerable repetition. The revised form will need to incorporate two definite changes. First, the Ability to Reflect and Revise teaching should be changed to the Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since there is no time for revision of lesson or unit plans within the context of this course. Second, the criterion on the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision should be eliminated and Revise teaching should be changed to the Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since there is no time for revision of lesson or unit plans within the context of this course. The revised form will need to incorporate two definite changes. First, the Ability to Reflect and Revise teaching should be changed to the Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since there is no time for revision of lesson or unit plans within the context of this course. Second, the criterion on the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision should be eliminated and Revise teaching should be changed to the Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since there is no time for revision of lesson or unit plans within the context of this course.

**Press for smaller classes (Creative Writing)**
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.

**Revise Learning Outcomes (R/C)**
Faculty in this concentration will revise the Rhetoric/Composition learning outcomes so that 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.

**Set target for the Knowledge of Rhetoric (R/C)**
Faculty in this concentration 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.

**Simplify senior seminar forms (Secondary English)**
Faculty members who have taught the senior seminar in this concentration have requested that the assessment sheet be simplified so that there are not so many categories. The current assessment sheet contains 17 criteria and consequently considerable repetition. The revised form will need to incorporate two definite changes. First, the Ability to Reflect and Revise teaching should be changed to the Ability to Reflect upon Teaching since there is no time for revision of lesson or unit plans within the context of this course. Second, the criterion on the Ability to Engage in Substantial Revision should be eliminated since the current curriculum does not allow time for the substantial revision of written work either.

**Written Communication**
This data on written communication in the core indicates that we should continue to address issues of style and mechanics as well as format as we encourage students toward sound ideas and organization structures that are effective for academic writing. We also need to continue to work on Development, clarity of Ideas, and Organization, as our goal for next year is to increase the percentages of success in the 5/6 range of the rubric. Because so much of the data fell within a range of 4.0 to 4.5 on the averages for major categories, we should also review the rubric and the way we are measuring the skills to be sure we are capturing student learning as accurately and effectively as we can. The data is richer than last year`s information in that a wider range of scores on the rubric are represented. However, the data falls toward the middle (the 4 level). A committee of graduate students who teach composition courses, as well as the Lower Division Committee and Director, revamped the rubric from 2005-06, removed the connection to grades in the levels of proficiency, and revised descriptions of categories. We will revise this rubric again for 2008 to see if we can get closer to the student strengths and problem areas in order to translate this data into the classroom. We will also gather data from students next year to compare with the perceptions of instructors regarding student writing.

**Additional Resources:** Considerable attention needs to be given to design CTW courses and to train faculty in the value and use of CTW courses.
Decrease class size in Creative Writing classes

The Creative Writing faculty will continue to appeal for a decrease in class size in Creative Writing classes to better give individual attention to students, drawing out their unique talent and providing for more time to concentrate in class and in conference on areas of grammar, style, and mechanics.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to produce effective written communications
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to revise literary works effectively | Applying literary studies to creative writing

Implementation Description: end of spring semester, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing faculty

Distinguish between poetry and fiction (CW)

In the assessment to date, no distinction has been made between the poetry students and fiction students when calculating portfolio and senior seminar results. The Creative Writing faculty would like to track performance in the two separate divisions of their concentration, and so in the future all Creative Writing assessment forms will indicate student’s choice of genre.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to produce effective written communications
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to revise literary works effectively | Applying literary studies to creative writing

Implementation Description: Beginning of the fall 2008 semester
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Revise all assessment forms

Two changes will be made to all assessment forms in all four concentrations. First, a criterion for “overall evaluation” will be added to all forms to provide more holistic information from the two assessment tools. Secondly, the assessment forms for the senior seminars in all concentrations will be changed to include two rankings for an “inadequate” score, one that reads “inadequate due to failing work” and one that reads “inadequate due to excessive absences and missing work.” This distinction is needed because in the past some instructors have used the “can’t determine” ranking to note the work of students who stop coming to class while others have used the “inadequate (failing)” ranking. If the inadequate scores for such students are factored into the overall score, they bring down the class average in an inaccurate way. With this distinction, only those students whose work is actually turned in and determined to be inadequate will be taken into account and factored into the class average. In addition, if a senior seminar instructor chooses the “can’t determine” ranking for any of the senior seminar criteria, he/she will be asked to provide an explanation for his/her choice in the comment section below. This will provide information about why particular learning outcomes are not evident in the work of the senior seminar.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Beginning of Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Revision of Secondary English assessment forms

The department is going to institute a bi-annual assessment review process. The Literature and Rhetoric and Composition concentrations will review their assessment materials in years that start in an odd number (2007-2008, for example). The student assessment form for the Secondary English portfolio needs to be revisited to see if it really provides the type of feedback we want to give students. (At present, the student form does not reference the learning outcomes; it may be desirable instead to have some degree of overlap between the student and the department form.) The department assessment form needs to be revised to make those criteria that are frequently determined to be "can’t determine" more relevant to the assessment measure. The assessment form for the senior seminar is far too lengthy with as many as eighteen criteria. The criteria are slanted towards particular assignments and need to be rewritten in more general terms in alignment with the learning outcomes instead.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications
- Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues

Implementation Description: early in the fall 2008 semester
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English committee
Revisit the Creative Writing portfolio

The department is going to institute a bi-annual assessment review process. The Literature and Advanced Rhetoric and Composition concentrations will review their materials in years that start with an odd number (2009-2010, for example); the Secondary English and Creative Writing concentrations will review their materials in years starting with an even number (2008-2009, for example). Rather than setting numerical targets for the portfolios in the Creative Writing concentration, the Creative Writing faculty would like to take time this year to engage in discussion to come to a better understanding of the portfolio as an assessment tool. As present, there is some question as to the value it has as a measure by which to determine the success of the Creative Writing program. One consideration is to reframe the portfolio by giving primacy to the evaluative essay over the creative content, since the creative content might not showcase all that the student has actually learned about writing through the program. To make this shift, it would be important to refine the explanation for students about what is expected of the evaluative essay.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Creative Writing | Outcome/Objective: Ability to comprehend texts
| Ability to create effective written communications | 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

Implementation Description: Fall 2008 semester
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing section

Set target for portfolios in Secondary English

It is problematic that the assessment score for the criterion that addresses "effective communications skills" has been below a 4.0 mean average in three of the four assessment cycles. Given that this criterion addresses skills that are critical to this concentration, the Secondary English faculty will set a target of 4.0 in this category for next year’s assessment cycle. To address this problem, extra emphasis will be given to the portfolio in the senior seminar and students will be informed that the writing in the portfolio is expected to be clear, purposeful, and grammatically sound.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolios in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to create effective written communications

Implementation Description: throughout 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Set target for Senior Seminar (Literature)

Since students did demonstrate a dramatic increase in communications skills, the Literature faculty will set a target to continue to build on this strength by encouraging faculty to incorporate presentations and other oral reports in 3040 and 3050 as well as other required classes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

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

Implementation Description: Throughout 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty in the Literature concentration

Set target for senior seminars (Secondary English)

One area that is particularly important to this concentration is the “knowledge of pedagogical theory.” The course curriculum includes articles on pedagogical theory, intended to expose students to educational frameworks for English studies. The department will set a target of at least a 4.0 average in this area of content knowledge for the 2008-2009 assessment cycle. Instructors will be encouraged to build activities into the course (perhaps as part of the CTW) that test student’s mastery of the pedagogical theory introduced in the course.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Seminar in Secondary English | Outcome/Objective: Ability to engage with contemporary/global issues
| Ability to teach effectively | Knowledge of English Education profession | Knowledge of English studies needed for teaching

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: 4330 instructors

Set targets for Rhetoric and Comp assessments

The Advanced Rhetoric and Composition faculty have set the following targets for 2008-2009: to meet the target of 4.1 for all the content goals; to set a target of 4.3 for all the skills goals; to continue the target from last year to define the writing technologies and practices we want our students to learn; to reevaluate the senior seminar capstone assignments and assessments and to overhaul the assessment form; and to find better means of capturing holistic evaluation data.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit 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

Set targets for senior seminars(CW)

While the department is eager to continue to reinforce the strengths of the Creative Writing senior seminar, it would also like to set a target of 4.3 for the two areas of relative weakness: "original, authentic, and engaging writing" and "grammatically/syntactically sound writing." To work towards these targets, the Creative Writing faculty will discuss methods for encouraging more original and engaging writing and will work to include more grammar instruction in course materials.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 | Applying literary studies to creative writing

Implementation Description: Throughout 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Creative Writing faculty

Track failures in the Senior Seminar

Some concern has been raised about the number of students who drop out of the senior seminar class. One supposition is that since this class is intended to take place during the last semester of their program, students may be inclined to drop out of or stop attending this class when they realize they are not going to be able to graduate during a particular semester. To determine whether or not this is true, the Assessment Coordinator will work with department staff to track the failure rate of this course and compare it to the failure rate of other 3000/4000 level English classes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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 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

Implementation Description: Throughout 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: ARC faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

(Strengths and developments in the Undergraduate Program as a whole) During 2007-2008, the Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) initiative was introduced into department's undergraduate studies program. CTW instruction was piloted in a limited number of sections of the department's gateway courses (3040/3050) and capstone courses (4300/4310/4320/4330), also called the senior seminar courses. Instructors in these classes found that the CTW assignments (usually smaller assignments that are aligned to particular learning outcomes) made students more aware of the skills they were acquiring and utilizing in their work. It is anticipated that as the CTW initiative is used in all sections of these courses, it will have an effect on assessment overall and on the senior seminars in particular. CTW assignments in the seminar break down the skills we expect students to master and communicate our expectations better; consequently, we should find improvement in some of our major objectives over the next few years, such as the ability to comprehend texts, the ability to think critically and interpret texts, and the ability to engage with contemporary/global issues. By focusing on these issues, instructors will help students to master the skills essential for successful work in the discipline. Another development in the undergraduate program was that a greater number of faculty members became involved in discussions about the nature and the processing of assessment in the department. In last year’s assessment report, the department expressed the intention of creating a standing committee on assessment to review and revise assessment documents and forms, to analyze assessment results, and to discuss topics surrounding assessment that are raised in department meetings and other topics. It was decided instead to use the Undergraduate Studies Committee as the venue for assessment decisions since this committee has...
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. The mission / purpose

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literary Theory (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Teaches with Cultural Responsiveness (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate that they create learning environments that promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 % of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on English grammars through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 % of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 % of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on literatures through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 % of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on literary theory through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 % of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on instructional practice through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on learning environments through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on professional development, inquiry, and collaboration through portfolio artifacts and either 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge of the standard on assessment through portfolio artifacts and either 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 strengthen 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

**Increase Publicity in English Ed M.Ed.**

Continued 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, mass mailings, and face-to-face communication.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** English Education Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Analysis of our data revealed that every English Education M.Ed. program graduate performed at high levels on all standards. Oral defenses of the portfolios demonstrated our students’ strengths in literatures, reading and writing processes, pedagogy, and professional development, inquiry, and collaboration. With respect to Action Item 1 from 2006-2007: “Increase Publicity in the English Ed M.Ed.”, program faculty revised and updated website information regarding certain program information documents, such as:
The probable result of these enhancements and publicity initiatives was that during academic year 2007-2008, 6 new students enrolled in the program.

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

Unsurprisingly, our faculty has identified enrollment to be an area of continued attention. We believe that getting the Georgia State Office of Public Relations involved would be helpful. The professionals there have the ear of journalists across the city and region, for both mass media and more specialized publications. Journalists whose beat is education might be interested in getting the word out about this valuable program. The key to an effective public relations campaign is diversification of channels. If people see newspaper articles that are then reinforced by a mention on television or the internet, the likelihood of sustained interest grows appreciably. Both old and new media ought to be involved. Georgia State has purchased an "island" on Second Life, the virtual world environment on the internet, and we should make sure the program is mentioned there. If the Journal-Constitution creates a special education section, we should also try to purchase ad space there. Our public relations department can answer these questions more fully, but if a "full court press" is required, then they need to be involved.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 English Education--TEEMS MAT**

*(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 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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
Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands and used 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

86% of our students in the English Education TEEMS 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Analysis of Alternative Models of Field Experience

Over the next year, TEEM English Faculty, practicum and student teaching supervisors, and cooperating teachers will collaboratively consider alternative models for field experience. Currently, the TEEMS English program completes a 6-week internship in fall with middle grades students and a full-time internship in spring in high schools. We wish to examine (a) the addition of a tutoring experience working one-on-one with struggling readers and writers, and (b) the possibilities of year-long internships in PDS sites. These changes are designed to increase interns’ abilities to work with diverse learners and to motivate and manage classrooms as a novice teacher.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008
Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail

Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008
Responsible Person/Group: TEEM English Education Faculty and Supervisors: Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail,

Implement + Analyze Alternative Field Experiences

In 2007-2008, TEEMS 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.

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

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 all 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. This increased collaboration and communication will benefit our students’ abilities in each of the ten learning outcomes/objectives for our program.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Implementation 2007-2008
Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty: Peggy Albers, Ewa McGrail, Michelle Zoss
Continued Focus on Community Relations

The TEEMS English Education program faculty works together to develop ties among students at GSU, mentor teachers, and ourselves. This continued focus on community relations will have an emphasis on urban issues in education. Developing a focus on "urban" is a move to increase interns' abilities in all student outcomes and program objectives, particularly their abilities to foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support urban secondary students' learning and well-being.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Community | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Systematizing Observations of Diverse Populations

The TEEMS English education faculty found that our students have rich experiences in English language arts classrooms in secondary schools. However, we see the need to attend to the increasing numbers of students in Atlanta area schools with special needs. That is, we are interested in providing means for our GSU interns to observe curriculum and pedagogy for students who use special education and gifted education services, as well as students who need language support because they are English Language Learners. Our plan to implement this action is to schedule specific observations in ESOL and special and gifted education classes as part of the fall semester of the year-long internship. Our goal with these observations is to help enrich our students' understanding of diversity in the communities in which they teach. This change is designed to increase interns' abilities in all student outcomes and program objectives, particularly their ability to cultivate their relationships in the school communities.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Community | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: 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 strengths of our TEEMS English Education program can continue to be found in our students' knowledge of their content area, their instructional practices, their ability to use assessments, communication skills, and technology to effectively plan instruction, and their reflective practices. For our Action Items this year, we seek to continue our focus on community relations (Action Item I) and to implement systematic means for students to observe students in exceptional populations: ESOL, special education, and gifted education students (Action Item II). For Action Item I, our focus on community relations will include an emphasis on working with our students to understand urban issues in education. Students will be working on urban education projects focused on community and literacy. We are also striving to maintain flows of communication among students, mentor teachers, and education faculty with the use of a cohort listserv, liaisons with the university's PDS schools, and increased formal and informal communication both in person and via email with our mentor teachers. For Action Item II, we will be creating an observation schedule as part of our students' year-long internship placement. This schedule includes regular observations in ESOL, special education, and gifted education classes. Our goal is to enrich our students understanding of both community and diversity.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Although all measures of our students’ performances were met at the target performance levels, we identified Action Items I and II to help us continue to encourage our students working knowledge of urban education and to foster relations among university faculty, secondary school teachers, and our GSU master’s students. Our model for course sequences and a year-long internship are two of the already established means for addressing the needs communication and attention to diversity.

---
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**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, 2)**

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) (M: 1, 2)**

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

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

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Knowledge of Theory (Literature) (M: 1, 2)**

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to formulate effective questions for master's level research.
Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 6: 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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 7: 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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 8: 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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 9: 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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1, 2)
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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 11: Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be familiar with the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era, although students may focus more on one time frame 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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 12: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1, 2)
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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 13: Effective Communications Skills-all concentrations (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 14: Researching Skills - all concentrations (M: 1, 2)**

Students will conduct graduate-level research on topics related to English studies and will demonstrate mastery in using traditional methods of research as well as non-traditional information technology.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 15: Evaluative Skills - all concentrations (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)**

Starting in fall of 2007, students who entered the M.A. program are required to complete a thesis by the end of their program (rather than being given the option of taking M.A. exams, as was the case in previous years). In the spring and summer of 2009, the students who entered under this new regulation will likely be completing their M.A. program, and so the department has developed a measure for assessing thesis work. An assessment form, which will be completed by faculty members on the student’s committee, will rate how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes, using a six-point scale. In the summer, the Associate Graduate Director will meet with the Assessment Coordinator to analyze the resulting data in order to make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change.

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Language (Literature)**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O4: Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O6: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O7: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O8: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O9: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O10: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O11: Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O12: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric (R & C)**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**Target for O13: Effective Communications Skills-all concentrations**
No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.
Target for **O14: Researching Skills - all concentrations**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

Target for **O15: Evaluative Skills - all concentrations**

No assessment data on the M.A. thesis was gathered this year, and therefore no targets were set.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the thesis requirement was only instituted in fall of 2007 and students who entered the program under this regulation were still in the early stages of the M.A. during the course of the year.

**M 2: Assessing work in the M.A. Pro-Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)**

In the spring 2008, the English department piloted two sections of a Pro-Seminar for students in the literature and Rhetoric and composition concentrations of the M.A. program. All students are required to take this course in the second semester of their M.A. This course is intended to serve a number of purposes: to inform students about professional aspects of their studies, to train students in scholarly vocabulary, to help students formulate effective questions for master’s level research, to give students experience with traditional research methods as well as non-traditional aspects of technology, and -- most importantly -- to guide students through a draft version of the prospectus for the thesis that they will write in the second year of their study. During the 2008-2009 school year, the English department will begin to assess student work in the Pro-Seminar by creating an assessment form which will be based on a 5-point scale and which will be aligned to the learning outcomes.

Target for **O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O2: Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O3: Knowledge of Language (Literature)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O4: Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O10: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

Target for **O11: Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C)**

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

### Target for O12: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric (R & C)

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

### Target for O13: Effective Communications Skills - all concentrations

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

### Target for O14: Researching Skills - all concentrations

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

### Target for O15: Evaluative Skills - all concentrations

The Pro-Seminar was only piloted in 2007-2008, so no targets were set for this year.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

There were no findings for this measure in 2007-2008 because the English department piloted the Pro-Seminar this year with the intention of adding an assessment component in the following year.

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

#### Develop criteria for M.A. thesis

The Graduate Director will created a list of criteria to accompany the M.A. thesis assessment form, similar to the criteria developed for the PhD dissertation assessment tool.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)
  - | Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) | Content Knowledge (Literature) | Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) | Knowledge of Language (Literature) | Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C) | Knowledge of Theory (Literature) | Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) | Revising Skills (Creative Writing) | Skills of Inquiry (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: Content Knowledge (Literature)
  - | Knowledge of Language (Literature) | Knowledge of Theory (Literature) | Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature) | Skills of Inquiry (Literature)
- **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: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)
Initiate pro-seminar classes (Literature)
Starting in the fall of 2007, all entering M.A. students in the Literature concentration will take 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

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

Create an assessment form for the Pro-Seminar
Now that the department has piloted the M.A. Pro-Seminar for two semesters, it is in a position to develop an assessment form to determine student success in this pivotal course. This assessment form will be written in alignment with the graduate learning outcomes and in anticipation of the thesis work that follows this course. It will also include a section for commentary where the Pro-Seminar instructor can include insights into the strengths and weaknesses of student work, as demonstrated in the draft prospectus produced in the course. The assessment (including the commentary) will be passed on to each student’s thesis director or, in cases where the thesis committee has not yet been decided, will be placed in the student’s file for later review.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Decide about Rhetoric & Composition Pro-Seminar
One of the challenges that emerged in the Pro-Seminar during 2007-2008 is that the instructors from the literary concentration felt they were not fully prepared to guide the prospectus work of students in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration. Consequently, the issue was raised as to whether or not the Rhetoric and Composition concentration should have its own Pro-Seminar. Will there be enough students to justify this course? How will the learning differ from the material covered in the literature Pro-Seminar? How will this course affect staffing in the concentration? These questions will be taken up by the Graduate Committee.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Develop criteria for thesis assessment form
The department has prepared assessment forms that can be used starting in the fall of 2008 for evaluating the M.A. thesis in the three different concentrations. These assessment forms are in alignment with the graduate learning outcomes for the M.A. program. However, the department also plans to develop a set of criteria for determining assessment (guidelines on the quality of work that
constitutes a particular ranking). When developed, this set will need to look different from the dissertation assessment criteria, which are geared towards the question of academic publication. Since M.A. theses are generally unpublishable (too long for articles, too short for publication), publishability will not be a valid criterion.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** M.A. Thesis  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)  
- **Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**  
- **Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)**  
- **Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**  
- **Researching Skills - all concentrations**  
- **Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

**Implementation Description:** End of the fall semester, 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Calvin Thomas, Graduate Director

---

### Set target for M.A. thesis

Since this will be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.A. thesis, it is difficult to set particular targets for this measure. Therefore, the department will set a basic threshold of 4.5 (based on a six-point scale) for all criteria used on the thesis assessment form. The data that is generated from the 2008-2009 results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the M.A. thesis is intended to demonstrate.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** M.A. Thesis  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)  
- **Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**  
- **Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C)**  
- **Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**  
- **Researching Skills - all concentrations**  
- **Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

**Implementation Description:** End of the fall semester, 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment coordinator

---

### Set target for the Pro-Seminar assessment

Since this will be the first year that the department will collect data on the M.A. Pro-Seminar, it is difficult to establish specific targets. Therefore, we will set a base target of 4.0 on all criteria of the assessment form. The data that is generated from the 2008-2009 results will enable the Graduate Director to set more specific targets in future years, as the department comes to a fuller understanding of what the objectives of the Pro-Seminar.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Assessing work in the M.A. Pro-Seminar  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge (Literature)  
- **Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C)**  
- **Knowledge of Theory (Literature)**  
- **Knowledge of Vocabulary (Literature)**  
- **Researching Skills - all concentrations**  
- **Skills of Inquiry (Literature)**

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

2007-2008 was a transitional year for the M.A. program for it was when the department instituted the thesis requirement (for students in all three concentrations) and the Pro-Seminar requirement (for students in the literature and Rhetoric and Composition concentrations). While the department did not gather systematic assessment data on the Pro-Seminar, the two instructors who taught the course gave anecdotal evidence suggesting that the course did achieve its intended goals. Students came out of the course with a polished draft of an MA thesis prospectus. This will considerably facilitate their steady advancement through the program. The course also helped to bolster student confidence and acquaint them with some crucial issues regarding professional development and methods of studying literature/culture at the graduate level. Students gained further familiarity with the profession through talks by visiting faculty members and through their attendance at some of the many job talks that took place in the department. Finally, the close examination given to writing—both their own and sample essays—helped students internalize the processes of research and writing.

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

A problem that occurred in the Pro-Seminar is that the instructors from the literature concentration found it difficult to advise the Rhetoric and Composition students on matters of professional development with any degree of authority. It was even a challenge to give useful feedback on the structure/methodology of the MA thesis prospectus, which is very different from that in the Literary Studies stream. The department will need to decide whether a separate Pro-Seminar should be developed for this concentration or whether the existing Pro-Seminar can be modified in a way that will accommodate the needs of both sets of students.
### 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 (Creative Writing) (M: 1, 2)**
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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing) (M: 1, 2)**
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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) (M: 1, 2)**
Ph.D. students will be able to produce writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. Students will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and the instructor, and to revise their creative works to create writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1, 2)**
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**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 1, 2)**
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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will have mastery of typical genres of academic writing and knowledge of those common in publication (e.g., research article, grant proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews). Students will have mastery of genres of writing needed for teaching (e.g., syllabi, course handouts, assignments, course web sites). Students focusing on Professional and Technical Writing will also have mastery of professional writing genres and electronic media (e.g., technical article, documentation, web sites for multiple purposes).

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 8: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and be able to apply them in their own assessment and interpretation of texts. This learning outcome for the Ph.D. in English is comparable to that for the M.A. with crucial differences in terms of specificity. Doctoral study aims for graduates to have demonstrated a higher degree of critical sophistication than master's level work.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature) (M: 1, 2)**

This learning outcome for the Ph.D. in English is comparable to that 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. Doctoral study aims for graduates to have greater mastery of content than master's level work.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 10: Researching - all concentrations (M: 1, 2)**

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 and to carry out focused, productive, and thorough research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 11: Effective Communication Skills - all concentrations (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in their particular concentration of English studies.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Ph.D. Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.
**Target for O6: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C)**

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C)**

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.

**Target for O8: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)**

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.

**Target for O9: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature)**

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.

**Target for O10: Researching - all concentrations**

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an "outstanding" ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.
Target for O11: Effective Communication Skills - all concentrations

In last year’s Ph.D. report, it was noted that since the lowest median score on the dissertation form of 4.3 was in the area of knowledge of theoretical effectiveness (Learning Outcome #2), greater emphasis might be given to this learning outcome. This year’s dissertation results show the same median score for this area, suggesting that this general target for improvement was not met.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

As the hyperlinked results for the Ph.D. program indicate, the dissertation results from 2007-2008 were lower than the previous years in all categories. As the median scores suggest, this was in large part due to low scores on two dissertations. The other five dissertations scored quite high in most categories. The overall decrease was also likely due to the fact that during 2007-2008 the Graduate Director discouraged dissertation committees from awarding an “outstanding” ranking to dissertations since this score was meant to be reserved for work that would be immediately ready for publication. Another finding worth noting is that the area of knowledge of major theoretical approaches received the lowest score in 2007-2008, just as it had the previous year.

M 2: Ph.D. exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

The Ph.D. examinations are conducted on-site in November and February of each year. Each student writes two exams (one in a primary area of study and a second in a secondary area). The candidate works with a primary advisor to create a reading list for each exam. The exams serve to demonstrate detailed and thorough knowledge of all facets related to the candidate’s study and dissertation area. Each exam is read by three faculty members and assessed on a scale of four possible grades: high pass, pass, low pass, fail. The readers provide written commentary that explains the assigned grades to the Director of Graduate Studies.

Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O2: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O3: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O4: Revising Skills (Creative Writing)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O5: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O6: Knowledge of Theory of Rhetoric (R & C)

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

Target for O7: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (R & C)
This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

**Target for O8: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)**

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

**Target for O9: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature)**

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

**Target for O10: Researching - all concentrations**

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

**Target for O11: Effective Communication Skills - all concentrations**

This is the first year that Ph.D. exam scores were included in the assessment report. No targets were set for this assessment tool last year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As the hyperlinked information on the Ph.D. program indicate, in 2007-2008, 18.9% of students received a high pass on the exams, 59.5% received a pass, and 21.6% received a low pass.

**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: 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  
**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
Enhance assessment of Ph.D. exams

When Ph.D. exams are read, reviewers provide commentary that explains their scoring to the Graduate Director along with a score of high pass, pass, low pass, or fail. To capture more assessment information from the exams, the Graduate Director will write a summary of the commentary of all the exams that can be used in the annual assessment report. Both the readers and the Graduate Director will be provided a copy of the relevant graduate learning outcomes to guide their commentary.

Rephrase criteria for dissertation assessment

Currently, a "6" on the assessment form corresponds to "outstanding," and the criterion for the outstanding ranking currently reads: "The dissertation represents an original, important, and distinctive contribution to the field, which could in its present form be submitted to a scholarly or academic press for book publication, and any one of its individual chapters could be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal for publication." Since this ranking is somewhat unrealistic in its expectation, the criterion should be shifted so that the "outstanding" would be what is now under "excellent", to wit: "The dissertation represents an original, important, and distinctive contribution to its field and with minimal revision and development could be submitted to an academic press for book publication, and any one of its individual chapters could be submitted to a peer-review journal for publication." Still, even with this revision of the criterion, committees will be discouraged from ranking a dissertation "outstanding" unless it truly meets this criterion.

Set target for dissertation (knowledge of theory)

In the two year's worth of data collected on the dissertations, the criterion that has consistently scored the lowest has been in the area of student knowledge of major theoretical approaches and student ability to apply this knowledge in the interpretation of the material chosen for the dissertation. While it can be difficult to anticipate an improvement in this area, since some dissertations have a more solid theoretical base than others, the department will set a rolling target to raise this score to a 4.5 over the next three years. During that time, the department will engage in discussions about ways to more consistently ensure student success in the understanding and application of theory.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

While the dissertation results decreased this year, one strength worth noting is the value that has emerged from the assessment process itself. During a dissertation defense, the student leaves the room at the end of the session and the committee discusses the work and decides together the scores to assign on the dissertation assessment form. These discussions have been very fruitful and often raise questions about and produce insights into the program itself. In this manner, the assessment process is working to facilitate the self-reflection that is important to the department's development. Another area of strength in our Ph.D. program can be seen in the publication record of students in the Creative Writing concentration. In 2007-2008, six Ph.D. students published poems in
literary journals, four published stories, four had books published, one won a poetry contest, and another was nominated for a best first novel award. A detailed list of these noteworthy successes can be found at http://workshop.gsu.edu/news.html. Because we have just added the Ph.D. Primary and Secondary Exams to our assessment process, we are not yet able to analyze that data for strengths and weaknesses but will do so next year when we have comparative data from two years. One additional note to make in this Ph.D. report is that the assessment measure related to the teaching done by GTAs that appeared in last year’s report has been deleted from this year’s report. The department decided that since only a portion of the Ph.D. students are given the opportunity to teach in our program, we should not include this measure in our assessment report.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Two years of assessment data for the dissertation reveal that students are weakest in demonstrating knowledge of major theoretical approaches and applying this knowledge to the interpretation of their chosen topic. This is likely going to be a difficult area to address because there is a great discrepancy among faculty in their expectations involving a student’s engagement with theory in the dissertation. We have set a rolling target of three years for improvement in this area to give us time as a department to discuss the role of theory in our Ph.D. program and the level of competence we want to set for our students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Exercise Science BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Kinesiology and Health in accord with the College of Education and the other colleges and departments of the university seeks an ever increasing degree of excellence in a wide variety of programs. The Department’s mission includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The department provides professional preparation and continuing education in each of these fields, generates and communicates knowledge, and serves the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science (M: 1, 5)
Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise science
Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor (M: 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of this program will be able to function at the American college of Sports Medicine health fitness instructor level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Can apply knowledge with special populations (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to assist individuals with special physical needs such as those with cardiovascular disease, obesity, hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Has effective practical skills (M: 2, 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate a high level of practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Ensures safety in physical activity settings (M: 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide information about insuring the safety of clients and training in safety and first responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrates competence with technology (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will have a level of competency that will enable them to effectively use contemporary technology to serve clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Program is becoming accredited by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students taking examinations in the major course work area of exercise science had an average pass rate of 95%.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
This program change took effect during the Fall of 2007. During this review period no students were eligible to take the exit examination.

**Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor**
90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
This program change took effect during the Fall of 2007. During this review period no students were eligible to take the exit examination.

**Target for O5: Has effective practical skills**
90% of the students will be expected to pass this exam

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
This program change took effect during the Fall of 2007. During this review period no students were eligible to take the exit examination.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate on subjective and practical examinations of 93%.

**Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor**
That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate on subjective and practical examinations of 93%.

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**
That 85% of the students will successfully pass these assessments

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate on subjective and practical examinations of
**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in Advanced First Aid and Safety had a pass rate of over 95% (defined as a "C" or better grade).

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in Advanced First Aid and Safety had a pass rate of over 95% (defined as a "C" or better grade).

**Target for O5: Has effective practical skills**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in Advanced First Aid and Safety had a pass rate of over 95% (defined as a "C" or better grade).

**Target for O6: Ensures safety in physical activity settings**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in Advanced First Aid and Safety had a pass rate of over 95% (defined as a "C" or better grade).

**Target for O7: Demonstrates competence with technology**

That 95% of our students will successfully complete this requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in Advanced First Aid and Safety had a pass rate of over 95% (defined as a "C" or better grade).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate of 93% on practical and written examinations.

**Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate of 93% on practical and written examinations.

**Target for O3: Achieves level of Health Fitness Instructor**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate of 93% on practical and written examinations.

**Target for O4: Can apply knowledge with special populations**

That 85% of our students will pass these requirements.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students enrolled in courses dealing with special populations had a passing rate of 93% on practical and written examinations.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students taking laboratory examinations and/or completed lab reports had an average pass rate of 92.5%. In addition, pass rates on the ability of students to assess the fitness levels of potential clients and to teach and modify activities during an exercise session exceeded 90%.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students taking laboratory examinations and/or completed lab reports had an average pass rate of 92.5%. In addition, pass rates on the ability of students to assess the fitness levels of potential clients and to teach and modify activities during an exercise session exceeded 90%.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students taking laboratory examinations and/or completed lab reports had an average pass rate of 92.5%. In addition, pass rates on the ability of students to assess the fitness levels of potential clients and to teach and modify activities during an exercise session exceeded 90%.

### M 7: Exercise Science Internships (O: 2)
Students will be evaluated on client interaction, fitness assessment, fitness programming and ability to use exercise science information with clients in a workplace setting.

#### Target for O2: Can assess clients’ fitness
100% of the students will successfully pass internships.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Student enrolled in the practicum and internship experiences had a 100% completion rate based on evaluations from clinical supervisors.

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

#### Class projects
Students will be asked to complete practical class projects that enhance fitness assessment skills.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Exercise Science Internships | Outcome/Objective: Can assess clients’ fitness
  - Measure: Exercise Science lab reports and quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Has effective practical skills

  **Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

#### Comprehensive review
The faculty continues to review outcomes and objectives.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Exam over Exercise Science content | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science

  **Implementation Description:** Fall, 2006
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty will evaluate the review to ensure 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
Ensure 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.
- Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Fall, 2008

Curriculum review
Review curriculum based on current accreditation requirements. Determine the need to assign academic credit (1 hour) to several laboratory courses.
- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Exam over Exercise Science content | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of exercise and fitness science
- Measure: Practical exams with special needs individuals | Outcome/Objective: Can apply knowledge with special populations
- Can assess clients’ fitness
- Implementation Description: Fall 2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Exercise science faculty

Exit examination procedures
Accreditation rules require that students take a nationally recognized certification/exit examination prior to graduation. The examination and administration procedures need to be developed.
- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Planned
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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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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.
addition, Program is seeking accreditation by the newly established Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

In the class that used GXT practical exams (KH 7550), students demonstrated success in this measure, with 100% passing rates. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 100% passing rates in all classes (KH 6280, 7500, 7510, 7550, 7620, and 7630). 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In the classes that used practical exams (KH 7500, 7550, and 7630), students demonstrated success in this measure, with 100% passing rates. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In the classes that used case studies and labs (KH 6280, 7510, 7550, and 7630), students demonstrated success in this measure, with passing rates ranging from 86% to 100%. Specific passing rates were 86% for KH 6280, 90% for KH 7510, and 100% for KH 7550 and 7630. Overall average passing rate exceeded 90%.

**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

**Course syllabi**

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: 2007-2008
- 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
### 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 2007-2008. 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.

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Film & Video BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST)

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University's Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students' oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors; about 450 are Film/video majors.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: cinema basics (M: 1, 2)**

Students will learn the basics of cinema that will lay the ground work for upper level courses.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology
### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

### 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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

### 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.

**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.

**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.

#### 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.

**Target for O2: cinema history**
The average of the scores should be 2.5 or higher based on the 1 - 4 scale.

**Target for O3: interpret cinema**
The average of the scores should be 2.5 or higher based on the 1 - 4 scale.

### 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.
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.

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.

Implementation Description: fall 07
Responsible Person/Group: Film/video faculty

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Finance BBA
As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the undergraduate BBA finance program is to prepare graduates to succeed in entry-level positions in finance and business in general. To achieve this goal, students should have proficiency in three general areas: (1) Communication skills. Students should be able to write and present financial business reports and presentations that are concise, to identify and evaluate key issues, and to reach supported conclusions. (2) Critical thinking skills. Students should be able to think critically. (3) Technical knowledge. Students should possess a strong technical knowledge of finance. Note: During the 2007-2008 academic year there were over 800 students enrolled in the BBA-Finance program. In addition, there were approximately 227 graduates of the BBA-Finance program during this interval.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: The development of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)
Learning Outcome Objective #1: Foundation Knowledge BBA/Finance majors should: 1. Apply the principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. 2. Illustrate the principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. 3. Assimilate a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
### 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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 1 Written Communication
  - 2 Oral Communication
  - 4 Critical Thinking
  - 5 Contemporary Issues

- Institutional Priority Associations
  - 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

- Strategic Plan Associations
  - 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Learning Outcome Objective #3: Analytical, Conceptual, and Integrative Skills in Finance BBA/Finance majors should: 1. Demonstrate advanced knowledge and capability in subareas such as corporation finance, investments, and financial institutions. 2. Be proficient in assessing the impact of a financial transaction on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. 3. Be able to propose, identify and/or assess the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio or derivatives thereof. 4. Be familiar with, and capable of applying, advanced paradigms for: identifying opportunities for creating value from financial strategies; evaluating financial alternatives, and identifying the strategy most suitable for the given financial circumstances and constraints of a particular decision; directing their technical, analytical, and conceptual skills to solve real world financial problems. 5. Be familiar with the ongoing educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance and other evolutionary processes in the discipline.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- Institutional Priority Associations
- Strategic Plan Associations

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)

To examine student performance in select courses (FI 4000, FI 4040 and FI 4300), the course-instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. See hyperlink for Exhibit 1. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in Exhibit 2 (see hyperlink for Exhibit 2). For each objective, we have 3-4 submeasures to map these learning objectives onto each of the three courses selected for the analysis.

**Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

See Finance results for measure 1.

**Target for O2: The development of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

See Finance results for measure 1.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least one-half of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results for measure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met

See Finance results 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target for the next academic year is to continue to identify and expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Partially Met

During the past academic year, 23 undergraduate students participated in field study courses at a number of prominent Atlanta area organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target for the next academic year is to continue to identify and expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Partially Met

During the past academic year, 23 undergraduate students participated in field study courses at a number of prominent Atlanta area organizations.
**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

---

**Careers and professionalism**
We seek to expand student awareness and knowledge of career development and alternative career paths in finance.

- **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

---

**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
- **Measure:** Representative questions from courses
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous
**Careers and professionalism in Finance**

We seek to expand student awareness and knowledge of career development and alternative career paths in finance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Enhance student practical training | Outcome/Objective: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
  - Implementation Description: continuous
  - Responsible Person/Group: Professor Craig Ruff

**Critical thinking through writing**

We seek to improve the critical thinking and written communication skills of students through the implementation of the University’s Critical Thinking through Writing Initiative. Within the finance major, this program will be implemented in our FI 4020 course, which is a required course for all finance majors.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Implementation Description:** continuous
  - Responsible Person/Group: Professors Rich Fendler and Pete Eisemann
  - Additional Resources: student assistants

**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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Enhance student practical training | Outcome/Objective: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
  - The development of technical skills
  - Implementation Description: continuous
  - Responsible Person/Group: Milind Shrikhande

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Student performance on representative questions selected from the three major courses of FI 4000 ("Fundamentals of Valuation"), FI 4040 ("Fundamentals of International Finance"), and FI 4300 ("Advanced Corporate Finance") show that the learning objectives outlined in the assessment plan continue to be met. To follow up on progress made during the year in regards to the 2006-2007 action plan, the following activities are noted. (1) Careers and professionalism. Several initiatives took place under the leadership of Professor Craig Ruff. These were implemented with the FI 4000 course, which is required of all finance majors as the first course in their major. The initiatives include a) the development and availability of on-line video interviews of finance professionals. Given the wide breadth of finance-oriented careers, several 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 service 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 further identifying additional corporate partners for the offering of field study opportunities for undergraduate finance majors. (3) Communication skills. The 'Writing Across the Curriculum' initiative has increasingly become 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. Professor Rich Fendler is serving as the Department's Ambassador in support of the University's efforts to implement this initiative.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Finance MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**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.

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Learning Outcome Objective #3: Analytical, Conceptual, and Integrative Skills in Finance MS/Finance graduates should: 1. Demonstrate advanced knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization. Students chose specializations from: • Corporation Finance, •Investments, or •Financial Institutions and Markets. 2. Develop substantial proficiency in financial topics outside their chosen specialization. Students must take 9 hours of coursework in their specialization area. The remaining 6 hours include courses from the other two topics areas, and the degree can accommodate a double specialization. 3. Develop proficiency in assessing the impact of a financial transaction on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. 4. Propose, identify and/or assess the inherent valuation and risk attributes of a security, a real asset, or a portfolio or derivatives thereof. 5. Demonstrate familiarity with, and capable of applying, advanced paradigms for: •identifying opportunities for creating value from financial strategies; •evaluating financial alternatives, and identifying the strategy most suitable for the given financial circumstances and constraints of a particular decision; •directing their technical, analytical, and conceptual skills to solve real world financial problems. 6. Develop familiarity with the ongoing educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance and other evolutionary processes in the discipline (such as financial engineering). 7. Demonstrate understanding of the essential themes and policy contributions of conceptual, technical and empirical articles in selected professional finance journals.

Relevant Associations: AACSB International

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80th percentile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80th percentile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median scores shall be at or above 80th percentile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: The development of foundation knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At or above two year moving average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: The development of technical skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At or above two year moving average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At or above two year moving average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: **Met**

See Finance results for measure 2.
M4: 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 students 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 identify and expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, 13 students completed field studies at organizations such as Smith Barney, CCG Investments, and Westminster Securities.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

Our target for the next academic year is to identify and expand opportunities for students to work with partner firms.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the past academic year, 13 students completed field studies at organizations such as Smith Barney, CCG Investments, 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
Our analysis shows that expectations on all outcomes/objectives are currently being met. In the spirit of continuous improvement, we continue to actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program in the hope that we will attract high quality students.

Success was observed in identifying new corporate partners for establishing additional field study courses. Going forward, we will maintain and improve upon these gains in student quality, there is need to refine certain aspects of the program based on formal and informal student feedback. 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. These substitutions have now been permitted during the past couple of years. In addition, the Department is reviewing its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace.

The quality of students entering the MS-Finance Program has maintained its improvement over the 2003-04 baseline year with average GMAT scores during 2007-08 at approximately 630, 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 formal and informal student feedback. These courses could be replaced with higher level courses tailored to each student’s career goals and prior preparation. These substitutions have now been permitted during the past couple of years. In addition, the Department is reviewing its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace.

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.

The quality of students entering the MS-Finance Program has maintained its improvement over the 2003-04 baseline year with average GMAT scores during 2007-08 at approximately 630, 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 formal and informal student feedback. 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. These substitutions have now been permitted during the past couple of years. In addition, the Department is reviewing its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace.

Our analysis shows that expectations on all outcomes/objectives are currently being met. In the spirit of continuous improvement, we continue to actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program in the hope that we will attract high quality students.

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

Curriculum
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 2 new professors (and 3 the prior academic year) 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 2007-2008 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, accommodates are made to students seeking multiple specializations. 2) Practical training. Success was observed in identifying new corporate partners for establishing additional field study courses. Going forward, we will continue to actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program in the hope that we will attract high quality students.

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 2 new professors (and 3 the prior academic year) 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 2007-2008 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, accommodates are made to students seeking multiple specializations. 2) Practical training. Success was observed in identifying new corporate partners for establishing additional field study courses. Going forward, we will continue to actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program in the hope that we will attract high quality students.

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 actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program in the hope that we will attract high quality students.
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.

---
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### 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, 8)**

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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
- 4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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, 6, 7, 8)**

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**

- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 4.3 Technology

**SLO 3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context (M: 3, 6, 7)**

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
SLO 4: Speaking French (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8)
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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology

SLO 5: Reading French (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
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
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 6: Writing in French (M: 3, 4, 7, 8)
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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology

SLO 7: Knowledge of francophone cultures (M: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language cultures.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Knowledge of francophone literatures (M: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8)
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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Understanding Spoken French (O: 2, 4, 7, 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students listening comprehension is slightly over the target level but slightly under last year`s score.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students listening comprehension is slightly over the target level but slightly under last year`s score.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students listening comprehension is slightly over the target level but slightly under last year`s score.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students listening comprehension is slightly over the target level but slightly under last year`s score.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

This year`s students scores surpass the target, but are lower that last year`s.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

This year`s students scores surpass the target, but are lower that last year`s.

**Target for O4: Speaking French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

This year`s students scores surpass the target, but are lower that last year`s.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year`s.

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met

Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year`s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Speaking French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Reading French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Writing in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target but the scores fell slightly from last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Writing in French (O: 1, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All French majors scored 5.00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Ability to teach French language and culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target, but scores are lower than last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Speaking French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target, but scores are lower than last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Reading French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target, but scores are lower than last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Writing in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students met the target, but scores are lower than last year’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Knowledge of Francophone Literature (O: 1, 5, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All French majors scored 5.00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

**Target for O5: Reading French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

### M 6: 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).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

**Target for O2: Understanding spoken French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

**Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

**Target for O5: Reading French**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

**Target for O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

**Target for O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
No data for 2007-2008

### M 7: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of French business concepts and context**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Speaking French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Reading French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Writing in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surpassed the target. The scores are as high as last year’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Ability to teach French language and culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Understanding spoken French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Speaking French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Reading French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: Writing in French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Knowledge of francophone cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td>Target: <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data for 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Knowledge of francophone literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target was</td>
<td>4 (student work was very good for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

No data for 2007-2008

---

**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
- Knowledge of francophone literatures | Knowledge of French business concepts and context | Reading French |
- Understanding spoken French
- Measure: Knowledge of Francophone Literature | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of francophone literatures | Reading French
- Knowledge of francophone literatures | Knowledge of French business concepts and context | Reading French | Speaking French |
- Understanding spoken French | Writing in French
- Measure: Reading French | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of francophone cultures |
- Knowledge of francophone literatures | Knowledge of French business concepts and context | Reading French | Speaking French |
- Understanding spoken French | Writing in French
- Measure: Writing in French | Outcome/Objective: Reading French |
- Speaking French | Writing in French

Implementation Description: Spring 08.  
Responsible Person/Group: French section of regular faculty

---

**Intermediate level readings**

Each regular professor may now choose the readings he or she prefers. A regular faculty member will be watching over the TAs or part-timers who might teach the intermediates, to help them choose appropriate readings.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium

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

- Measure: Knowledge of Francophone cultures | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of francophone cultures |
- Knowledge of francophone literatures | Reading French
- Measure: Reading French | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of francophone cultures |
- Knowledge of francophone literatures | Reading French | Writing in French |
- Measure: Writing in French | Outcome/Objective: Reading French |
- Writing in French

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008  
Responsible Person/Group: French section’s regular faculty

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Assessments show that although French majors surpassed the goal of 4.0 in every area except one, the averages are lower than last year’s. 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 are lower than 06-07: knowledge of business practices and knowledge of teaching practices, fell slightly. Writing and literature knowledge fell from 5.00 and 4.24 to 4.19 and 3.96 respectively.

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

The lowering of the writing score to 4.24, while meets the goal, hints at the necessity to implement changes that will improve writing from the intermediate level on. The overall score of 3.96 literature requires a revision of both, the instrument and the preparation. The French section will attempt to restructure their approach to the teaching of literature and writing in the intermediate level in order to encourage students with an interest in literature to start reading. The French section is also making available recordings of the readings to reinforce concepts of pronunciation and intonation.
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 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**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)**
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

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

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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Communication -- Oral (M: 2, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Communication -- Visual (M: 2, 3, 12, 15, 19, 20, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving (M: 2, 4, 5, 19, 21)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively and appropriately apply quantitative methods to geographical problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) (M: 2, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) (M: 3, 10, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection (M: 2, 12, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively collect appropriate evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Technology (M: 2, 3, 6, 19, 21)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines (M: 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Collaboration (M: 3, 8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Contemporary Issues -- &quot;Global&quot; (M: 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking

SLO 13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24)
Students demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts.

SLO 14: Communication -- Written (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23)
Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography) A (O: 12, 13, 14)
This measure is based on student performance on the final examination. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, and 10, respectively, were 3.9, 3.8, and 3.9. All three outcomes were met.

Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, and 10, respectively, were 3.9, 3.8, and 3.9. All three outcomes were met.

Target for O14: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, and 10, respectively, were 3.9, 3.8, and 3.9. All three outcomes were met.

M 2: GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography) B (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14)
This measure is based on student performance on the final project. 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 exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O2: Communication -- Visual
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O8: Technology
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O14: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.9, 3.9, 4.0, 3.2, 4.2, 4.5, 3.7, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

M 3: GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography) C (O: 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14)
This measure is based on student performance and participation in 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 exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O8: Technology
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O10: Collaboration
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O14: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were 14 Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 4.1, 4.3, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

M 4: GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis) A (O: 3, 4, 12, 13)
This measure is based on student responses on final examination. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for O3: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, and 10, respectively, were 3.2, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.1. All outcomes were met.

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, and 10, respectively, were 3.2, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.1. All outcomes were met.

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, and 10, respectively, were 3.2, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.1. All outcomes were met.

Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, and 10, respectively, were 3.2, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.1. All outcomes were met.

M 5: GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis) B (O: 4, 12, 13, 14)
This measure is based on student statements in final assignment. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for O4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively, were 2.9, 3.6, 2.9, and 2.9. Outcomes 1, 6, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) apply quantitative
methods to geographical problems; and (3) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively, were 2.9, 3.6, 2.9, and 2.9. Outcomes 1, 6, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (3) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively, were 2.9, 3.6, 2.9, and 2.9. Outcomes 1, 6, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (3) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively, were 2.9, 3.6, 2.9, and 2.9. Outcomes 1, 6, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) apply quantitative methods to geographical problems; and (3) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**M 6: GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis) C (O: 8)**

This measure is based on student proficiency of software used for 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 O8: Technology**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were ten Geography majors in this course. The mean score for outcome 11 was 3.4 The outcome was met.

**M 7: GEOG 4644 (Environmental Conservation) A (O: 1, 11, 12)**

This measure is based on student performance on final examination. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, and 14,respectively, were 4.0, 4.3, and 4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, and 14,respectively, were 4.0, 4.3, and 4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, and 14,respectively, were 4.0, 4.3, and 4. All outcomes were met.

**M 8: GEOG 4644 (Environmental Conservation) B (O: 1, 10, 11, 12)**

This measure is based on student performance on final project. 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 exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, 12, and 14, respectively, were 5.0, 3.0, 5.0, and 5.0. Outcomes 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Collaboration**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, 12, and 14, respectively, were 5.0, 3.0, 5.0, and 5.0. Outcomes 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, 12, and 14, respectively, were 5.0, 3.0, 5.0, and 5.0. Outcomes 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 10, 12, and 14, respectively, were 5.0, 3.0, 5.0, and 5.0. Outcomes 10 was not met. Therefore, the students did not evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: GEOG 4644 (Environmental Conservation) C (O: 1, 10, 11)**
This measure is based on student performance and participation in 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 O1: Communication – Oral**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 12, and 14, respectively, were 3.5, 5.0, and 5.0. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Collaboration**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 12, and 14, respectively, were 3.5, 5.0, and 5.0. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were four Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 12, and 14, respectively, were 3.5, 5.0, and 5.0. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: GEOG 4764 (Urban Geography) A (O: 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14)**
This measure is based on student weekly response papers. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 11: GEOG 4764 (Urban Geography) B (O: 11, 12, 13, 14)**

This measure is based on student answers on written exams. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 3.8, 3.8, and 4.0. All outcomes were met.

**M 12: GEOG 4764 (Urban Geography) C (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**

This measure is based on student presentation of scholarly work. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O2: Communication -- Visual**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.

**M 13: GEOG 4778 (Political Geography) A (O: 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14)**

This measure is based on student weekly response papers. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were six Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.8, 3.8, 4.0, 3.8, 3.7, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.0, and 3.7. All outcomes were met.
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**M 14: GEOG 4778 (Political Geography) B (O: 5, 11, 12, 13, 14)**
This measure is based on student term papers. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**M 15: GEOG 4778 (Political Geography) C (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O14: Communication – Written**
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.0, 4.0, 3.5. Outcomes 1, 2, 7, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) communicate using appropriate writing conventions and formats; (3) formulate questions for geographical research; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.
This measure is based on student presentation of scholarly work. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O2: Communication – Visual**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O7: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O9: Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.
Target for **O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

Target for **O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

Target for **O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were two Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.0, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 3.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5. Outcomes 1, 4, 9, and 10 were not met. Therefore, the students did not do the following effectively or appropriately or both: (1) demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts; (2) develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping; (3) collect evidence; and (4) evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

M 16: GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change) A (O: 7, 13, 14)

This measure is based on student responses on take-home examinations. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, and 9, respectively, were 3.6, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.

Target for **O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, and 9, respectively, were 3.6, 3.5, and 3.5. All outcomes were met.

Target for **O14: Communication -- Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1 and 2, respectively, were 4.0 and 3.3. All outcomes were met.

M 17: GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change) B (O: 13, 14)

This measure is based on student paragraphs derived from lecture material. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for **O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1 and 2, respectively, were 4.0 and 3.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for **O14: Communication -- Written**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1 and 2, respectively, were 4.0 and 3.3. All outcomes were met.

**M 18: GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change) C (O: 1)**

This measure is based on student oral presentations. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcome 3 was 3.4. This outcome was met.

**M 19: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) A (O: 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14)**

This measure is based on student portfolios. 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 exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O8: Technology**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O9: Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

#### Target for O14: Communication -- Written

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.2, 3.0, 3.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4. Outcome 2 was not met. Therefore, the students did not communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

#### M 20: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) B (O: 1, 2, 9, 10, 11)

This measure is based on student final presentations. 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 exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 4, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.4, 3.6, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4. Outcome 12 was not met. Therefore, students did not participate effectively in collaborative activities.

#### Target for O2: Communication -- Visual

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 4, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.4, 3.6, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4. Outcome 12 was not met. Therefore, students did not participate effectively in collaborative activities.

#### Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 4, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.4, 3.6, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4. Outcome 12 was not met. Therefore, students did not participate effectively in collaborative activities.

#### Target for O10: Collaboration

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 4, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.4, 3.6, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4. Outcome 12 was not met. Therefore, students did not participate effectively in collaborative activities.

#### Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were eight Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 3, 4, 12, 13, and 14, respectively, were 3.4, 3.6, 2.6, 3.2, and 3.4. Outcome 12 was not met. Therefore, students did not participate effectively in collaborative activities.

#### M 21: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) C (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13)

This measure is based on student proficiency at demonstrating geotechnical skills. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

#### Target for O3: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.
Target for **O4: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O8: Technology**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

Target for **O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There were five Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, were 3.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.4, and 3.8. Outcome 5 was not met. Therefore, student did not perform arithmetic operations effectively.

**M 22: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) D (O: 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14)**

This measure is based on student weekly response papers. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for **O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

Target for O14: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.0, 3.7, 3.9, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.3. All outcomes were met.

M 23: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) E (O: 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14)
This measure is based on student research papers. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Target for O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O12: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

Target for O14: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14, respectively, were 4.0, 4.0, 4.3, 3.9, 4.1, 3.9, and 4.6. All outcomes were met.

M 24: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) F (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
This measure is based on student presentation of scholarly work. 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 exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

Target for O2: Communication -- Visual
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

Target for O5: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

Target for O6: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines
The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.
There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O12: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

**Target for O13: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

The mean score of students for each outcome exceeds 3.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There were seven Geography majors in this course. The mean scores for outcomes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, respectively, were 4.1, 4.1, 3.9, 3.9, 3.9, 4.2, 4.2, 4.4, 4.4, and 4.4. All outcomes were met.

**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:** 20 August 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy E. Diem

**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.
### 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
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 20 August 2007
- Responsible Person/Group: Jeremy E. Diem

### Equal number of measures for the learning outcomes

Each learning outcome will be assessed with ten measures next year. There will be 21 measures next year (i.e., three measures for each of the seven core courses). GEOG 4830 was taught twice in 2007-2008 by two different instructors; thus, there were three additional measures in 2007-2008. Having ten measures for outcomes 5 (student performs arithmetic operations effectively) and 6 (Student applies quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively) will improve greatly assessment of students’ quantitative skills.

#### Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Priority: High

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4518 (Digital Cartography)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4520 (Quantitative Spatial Analysis)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4618 (Urban Geography)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4618 (Urban Geography)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4784 (Climatic Change)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar)</td>
<td>Communication -- Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar)</td>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List learning outcomes on course syllabi

Instructors of the seven core course will list on their syllabi the learning outcomes to be assessed in the course.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Measure: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Communication -- Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Description:</th>
<th>18 August 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Jeremy E. Diehm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table content continues with detailed learning outcomes and course codes]
Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) | Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) | Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
Measure: GEOG 4830 (Senior Seminar) F | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
| Communication -- Oral | Communication -- Visual | Contemporary Issues -- "Global" | Contemporary Issues -- Diverse
Disciplines | Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection | Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation | Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) | Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) | Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition

Implementation Description: 18 August 2008
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 2007-2008 assessment was a major improvement on the 2006-2007 assessment. The three action plan resulting from the 2006-2007 assessment was as follows: (1) assess all learning outcomes; (2) provide instructors with rubrics; and (3) focus on outcomes that were not met. The first two plans were implemented strongly. Rubrics were provided to the instructors of the seven core courses of the Geography program, thereby resulting in all learning objectives being assessed, with the typical number of measures per outcome being nine. Therefore, with the data collection for the 2007-2008 assessment being superior to that for the 2006-2007 assessment, more attention was placed implicitly on the outcomes not met in the previous year. There is much confidence in the results from the 2007-2008 assessment due to the fact that were 24 measures and a total of 128 observations. When combining the data for all 24 measures, every learning outcome was met.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Two learning outcomes dealing with quantitative skills require continued attention. The mean scores for outcome 5 (student performs arithmetic operations effectively) and outcome 6 (student applies quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively) were considerably lower than the mean scores for the other outcomes: the mean scores for the two outcomes were 3.1 and 3.3, respectively, while the next lowest score for the remaining learning outcomes was 3.7. Nevertheless, those two outcomes were only assessed with two and five measures, respectively. It would be ideal if at least ten measures were used to assess each learning outcome. In general, outcomes that had more measures had higher mean scores than did outcomes with fewer measures. Therefore, the number of measures per outcomes needs to be uniform. With even better data collected as part of the 2008-2009 assessment, it can be determined with much more confidence if outcomes associated with quantitative methods require continued attention.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Geography MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The geography program of the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas. Through scholarship, teaching, and service, the geography program of the Department of Geosciences is dedicated to improving our community, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: 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

O/O 7: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) (M: 1)
Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Comprehensive exam, thesis/practicum, and seminars (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)
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).

Target for O1: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O2: Communication -- Written
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O3: Communication -- Oral
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O4: Communication -- Visual
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O5: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O6: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O8: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O9: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for O10: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.
Target for **O11: Technology**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for **O12: Collaboration**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for **O13: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

Target for **O14: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

**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

**Provide seminars with rubrics and measures**
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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** August 18, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeremy Crampton

**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:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Comprehensive exam, thesis/practicum, and seminars
- Outcome/Objective: Communication -- Oral
  | Communication -- Visual
  | Communication -- Written
  | Contemporary Issues -- "Global"
  | Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines
  | Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection
  | Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation
  | Critical Thinking -- Question
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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Jeremy Crampton

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Geology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Geosciences' (Geology Program participation in the Critical Thinking Initiative is focused upon the two core courses - GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122 (Introduction to Geosciences I and II). Our mission is to provide our students the opportunity to go beyond the memorization of geological facts in order to critically evaluate the major concepts related to Earth Science. The implementation of a "critical thinking" component to the core curriculum should help students to think more broadly and to better appreciate how Geology impacts the world they live in.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Thinking -- Core (M: 1)
The objective of the Geosciences Department (Geology BS program) is to develop and implement a means of assessing our student’s ability to think critically within our undergraduate core courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Critical Thinking Initiative (O: 1)
Every semester faculty members teaching GEOL 1121 and/or GEOL 1122 devise specific test questions (either multiple choice or short essay) that require students to analyze course material in a broader manner than that which was explicitly taught covered during the lecture. The student responses to these specific "Critical Thinking" questions are then monitored by the faculty member when the tests are graded.

Target for O1: Critical Thinking - Core
Our targeted performance level for the "Critical Thinking" portion of the core in GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122 is 80% correct response for each class.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
During the past year our GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122 students performed at a level of approximately 65-75% on most of the Critical Thinking questions. This percentage is somewhat lower than our student’s performance on the other portions of our examinations. We believe that this performance level, while lower than our target of 80%, is reasonable given the objectives of the initiative.
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 our faculty continue to challenge our core-course students with very worthwhile questions that require some measure of "critical thinking" in Geology. The faculty also continue to monitor the student's performance on these questions and performance levels are approximately the same as they have been in the past (i.e. ~65-75% accuracy).

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We continue to need more faculty to incorporate a specific "critical thinking" aspect to their tests so we can better assess student performance.

Annual Report Section Responses

Challenges
none

Research and Scholarly Activities
does not apply

Public/Community Service
does not apply

International Activities
does not apply

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Geology BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(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: 1, 7)
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
2 Oral Communication

Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

SLO 2: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities (M: 8)
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
3 Collaboration

Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
## SLO 3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field (M: 2, 9, 10, 11)

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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

## SLO 4: Critical thinking in Science and Geology (M: 12)

General Learning Outcome 4: Each graduate shall develop skills in critical thinking as it relates to science in general and to geology in particular. Specific Outcomes: 4a. Each graduate will be able to develop valid research questions and hypotheses 4b. Each graduate will be able to use appropriate techniques of data acquisition and interpretation 4c. Each graduate will have skills for problem solving and formulation of new questions in geosciences.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

## SLO 5: Physical Constitution of the Earth (M: 3)

General Learning outcome 6: Each graduate shall have a general understanding of the physical constitution of the earth. Specific Outcomes: 6a. Each graduate will be able to characterize and identify common rocks and minerals in hand specimen and in thin section using the petrographic microscope. 6b. Each graduate will have seen rocks in the field, be familiar with complications associated with field-based identification (e.g. surficial weathering) and be able to comprehend large three dimensional structures. 6c. Each graduate will be able to characterize the fundamental attributes of atoms and atomic bonding as they relate to crystal structures. 6d. Each graduate will be able to relate physical properties of the rock forming minerals to the crystal structure and chemistry of the minerals. 6e. Each graduate will be able to describe the gross chemical layering of the earth (inner and outer core, mantle, crust) and explain what lines of evidence have been used to deduce this structure. 6f. Each graduate will be able to describe the distribution of continents and ocean basins, and locations of major physiographic features such as mountain belts, oceanic ridges, oceanic trenches, and oceanic island chains.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

## SLO 6: Earth’s Internal and external processes (M: 4)

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.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

## SLO 7: Earth and Solar System History (M: 5)

General Learning outcome 8: Each graduate shall develop a general understanding of the history of the earth and the solar system. Specific Outcomes: 8a. Each graduate will be able to relate general principles of stellar nucleosynthesis and the nebular hypothesis for origin of the solar system. 8b. Each graduate will be able to explain how earth history is divided into the standard geological time scale, and relate the general historical character of each major time division. 8c. Each graduate will be able to identify some common representatives of both vertebrate and invertebrate fossils and place them correctly within the geologic time scale. 8d. Each graduate will be able to explain the fundamentals of biological evolution, particularly in regard to the fossil evidence for biological change through geologic time.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 9: Skills common to geologic professionals (M: 2)**

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**

4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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 (organized, focussed, attention to making proper citations to published literature).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students are writing to learn geologic concepts frequently in many courses in this program to help the students learn geologic concepts (GEOL 3002, 4006, 4013, 4015, 4016, 4017 and 4120). Students can not graduate without taking courses that have significant writing components (WAC model or writing intensive).

**M 2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

This skill is assessed in Structure and Field courses.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

This skill is assessed in Structure and Field courses.

**M 3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students are not lost in the upper division courses and are ready to take on more complex topics. Our students do well in the field course in Montana.

**M 4: 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%
### M 5: 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.

**Target for O7: Earth and Solar System History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O7 Rating</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in Measure 9, the typical "C" student is not lost and is ready to take on more complex topics in Geology.

### M 6: 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O8 Rating</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty report some divergence of opinion on this topic. Some feel more exposure to geobiology topics is warranted.

### M 7: 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O1 Rating</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>student can clearly articulate their ideas and can construct a well organized, oral presentation perhaps with a few rough edges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Students need more opportunities for critical thinking and analysis in each course.

### M 8: Collaborative Skills Rubric (O: 2)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – skills not assessed 1 - student only works alone. 2 - student struggles in a group setting, is passive or otherwise contributes little to group work may distract group with chatting etc. 3 - student can work in group setting, makes contributions but may distract group from its purpose with complaints off topic chatter etc. 4 - student works well in a group making contributions to group work while being open to contributions by others. 5 - student functions as a leader in a group setting by making proactive positive contributions while honoring and encouraging the contributions of others.

**Target for O2: Skills in Collaborative Exercises and Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O2 Rating</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>students work are learning to work well in group settings (making contributions to group work while being open to contributions by others).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

There are opportunities to work in collaborative settings via Geoscience Learning Community and with student-faculty research teams in GEOS. Students may elect to join these teams or to enroll in the GLC. When they do, the collaborations are successful in terms of producing publishable work (peer reviewed papers, presentations at GSA).

### M 9: Quantitative Skills Rubric (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skills not assessed 1 - student is math phobic has difficulty interpreting graphs 2 - student can move between graphs and numbers with assistance and does not understand basic algebraic concepts 3 - student can move between graphs and numbers can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations with assistance 4 - student can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations 5 - student is comfortable with math, can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations can fit curves and or perform other advanced mathematical operations.

**Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O3 Rating</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>students can move between graphs and numbers easily can perform algebraic and trigonometric operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Most courses in the major and elective courses require students to be able to perform algebraic and trigonometric operations. Complex spatial analysis is required in GEOL 3002 and Petrology (comprehension and interpretation of phase diagrams). Elective courses in hydrology and environmental geology use exponential functions and concepts covered in elementary
M 10: Technology Skills Rubric (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - student is computer phobic does not know how to use a computer 2 - student is familiar with windows based applications, can save files, open applications and documents 3 - student is familiar with entering numbers into excel 4 - student can perform calculations in excel and make graphs 5 - student can use a variety of quantitative applications eg. arc view, rockware

**Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field**
4 - student can perform calculations in excel and make graphs

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students are able to use excel, make graphs and solve algebraic problems with Excel. Courses in Minerlogy (3002), Petrology, Hydrogeology, and Environmental Geology all use Excel for calculations and analysis of data. Most students have used Excel before entering these classes and this was not the case prior to assessment.

M 11: Field Skills Rubric (O: 3)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated "typical C student" according to the following rubric: 0 – Skill not assessed 1 - student is unfamiliar with field techniques and protocols 2 - student does not understand aspects of using a brunton, cannot read a topographic map reliably 3 - student can use a brunton correctly part of the time, and can tell up from down on a topographic map 4 - student can use a brunton, and locate themselves using a topographic map with assistance. 5 - student can use a brunton, locate themselves using a topographic map without assistance.

**Target for O3: Quantitative, technological, laboratory and field**
4 - student can use a brunton compass, and locate themselves using a topographic map with assistance.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
These skills are assessed in the required Field Course in Montana (summer). Faculty report success in teaching these skills.

M 12: Critical Thinking Rubric (O: 4)
Faculty teaching majors courses rated “typical C student” according to the following rubric 0 – skill not assessed 1 - student operates in the domain of memorization, does not know how to analyze information 2 - student is not clear on how one develops valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems 3 - with extensive guidance student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems 4 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems with some guidance 5 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems.

**Target for O4: Critical thinking in Science and Geology**
4 - student can develop valid research questions and hypothesis, acquire and interpret data and solve problems with some guidance

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
This skill is difficult to assess accurately without requiring research experiences. More opportunities are needed in this area, perhaps done via scheduled exams where questions are asked to analyze data.

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

**Improve collaborative skills**
Strategies for guiding students through group work will be shared with faculty.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

**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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical thinking core | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking--Core

Implementation Description: Spring 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Seth Rose
Additional Resources: None

Strengthen knowledge of Earth processes
Faculty will meet to discuss strategies for strengthening students knowledge of Earth processes.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth Processes | Outcome/Objective: Earth’s Internal and external processes

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Strengthen knowledge of Earth’s constitution
Faculty will meet to discuss strategies for strengthening students knowledge of Earth’s constitution.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of Earth’s Physical Constitution | Outcome/Objective: Physical Constitution of the Earth
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: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

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: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

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: Department Chair (W. Crawford Elliott)

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (W. Crawford Elliott)

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (W. Crawford Elliott)

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

Provide space for student collaboration
The department will continue to maintain the undergraduate lounge as a place where students may study and work together.
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

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

Critical thinking and analysis.

Students need more experience with critical thinking and analysis of data.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Earth Processes(geobiology, geologic time)

Earth Processes(external, paleontology, geologic time).

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Oral Communication Rubric

Provide more opportunities for students to learn how to make good oral presentations.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The B.S. degree in Geology is especially strong. Our students receive an excellent education (basic discipline knowledge, quantitative skills, field skills and analysis). We are strong in providing opportunities to learn via writing (WAC model and other models). Some opportunities exist for research and group study. Where done, these students produce good results by presenting papers at professional conferences (Geological Society of America) and one student published a paper in 'Southeastern Geology' as a lead author. Most of our scores are in the 3 and 4. More attention to critical analysis, public speaking, presentations of results are warranted.

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

By continued attention, we are interested in providing a top-notch education for our majors. All facets of our program are examined. We plan to continue to use writing as a tool for increased and enhanced learning at the upper division levels. Where possible, we continue to provide research opportunities for our undergraduate students either as being part of research groups or through the Geoscience Learning Community. The GLC workroom (the Green Room) is used well to help provide opportunities for group learning. A distinctive facet of our program is our field course in Montana (required for all GEOl majors). Here they put together the concepts that they have learned over the years and this course arguably is our capstone course. We have employed new technology (toughbook and digital mapping) to this course. The grades are not in, the informal feedback from the SU 08 course was very positive learning experience for our students. Our introductory classes are taught well. The scores earned in the laboratory sections of introductory geology track well with the lecture grades per faculty feedback. We continue to monitor how we teach these courses.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Newsletter was produced and distributed twice since last report. Requested employment data and will circulate and alumni questionnaire to capture this information. By and large, the students wanting employment in Geosciences following completion of the M.S. degree have success finding employment in the Geosciences and/or further graduate study in good Ph.D. programs. One recent graduate student was admitted to University of Arizona’s Ph.D in hydrology (a highly competitive program and he just passed his comprehensive exam.). Faculty members have not had to work hard in placing our students.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Four students graduate with M.S. degree in Geology. This is two more students than the previous year. One student completed the thesis option and produced an excellent thesis as per the committee comments showing depth and sophistication (item c above).

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

Gather more data

Our program is small, graduating six or fewer graduate students per year. The small numbers necessarily limit the type of analysis that we can perform on any given class and raises issues of privacy in reporting. Therefore, we intend to aggregate our graduate data over two or three year periods for the purposes of analysis and reporting.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni data | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills
Measure: Faculty ratings of Non-thesis M.S. students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills

Implementation Description: September 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Revise graduate program learning outcomes

In constructing this report, we realized that, at the time that the graduate program learning outcomes were written, there was substantial confusion about the nature of learning outcomes and their application to the graduate program in particular. The department will revise the graduate program learning outcomes to better reflect and make explicit our expectations for graduate student performance.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty ratings of Non-thesis M.S. students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills

Implementation Description: January 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair (Tim La Tour)

Develop and implement new assessment measures

Since the department has completely revised the learning outcomes for the Geology MS program it is now necessary to devise and implement new measures that are consistent with the learning outcomes.

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

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

Gather more data

We will continue to gather and aggregate data for the Geology MS program. This action can be accomplished when more students are graduated per year from this program or after more time has elapsed. The short reporting period gives us very small numbers to work with for the assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni data | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills
  Measure: Faculty ratings for MS thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills
  Measure: Faculty ratings of Non-thesis M.S. students | Outcome/Objective: Graduate knowledge and skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. W. Crawford Elliott, Department Chair

Alumni questionnaire, employment survey
We plan to obtain hard numbers on our students to determine the number employed, looking for employment (or further graduate study). This action does not have a high priority as it will be done as part of APR in FA 09.

  Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Low
  Implementation Description: Sept, 2009
  Responsible Person/Group: W. Crawford Elliott

Graduation Rate
Maintain and improve graduation rate. Last year we graduated four students from the M.S. degree program, we would like to attain that number or improve on that goal. Develop a more formalized way to collect data regarding quality of thesis and non-thesis products.

  Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium

Non-thesis exam/paper performance
Improve performance of non-thesis comprehensive exam and non-thesis research projects.

  Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
  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?
Our students obtain employment readily as per statements from our students although we do not have an extensive hard data base to support this conclusion. The one student who completed a thesis did so in an excellent way showing a steadfast and diligent effort (and helps the program greatly). The performance in non-thesis projects and comprehensive exam is highly variable and highly dependent on student's attitude and dedication to completion of degree. Our graduation numbers improved from two (both non thesis) to four (thesis and three non-thesis) students relative to last year. Noted was variable quality of non-thesis students and the excellent quality of the one thesis student(excellent oral exam, and written thesis). The analysis also must consider our extensive effort devoted to the Ph.D. Chemistry-Geology Concentration. Data from students enrolled in Ph.D. Chemistry with Geology specialization is not included here for the M.S. program. We include these data here to note that during the past year two students completed this program. A third passed his Ph.D. oral exam at the time of writing this report. Our faculty members contribute greatly and devote much time and effort to Ph.D. degree program in Chemistry. The two students completing our program have good positions(one tenure track faculty position and one senior scientist job at GAEPD). The third student has a tenure-earning position awaiting him at GA Perimeter College. Going back to student success, we devote much effort to prepare our student and our students are successful in taking the next steps after GSU.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The numbers of students completing the degree requirements increased from two to four. The completion rate needs monitoring. The quality of students is variable and lead to variable quality in performance on non-thesis papers or comprehensive exams.
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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

**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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues  
7. Technology

**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  
4. Critical Thinking

**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**

4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues

**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**

2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration

**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
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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 7: Ability to teach German language and cultures (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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 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 or misunderstanding in content requirement) on a scale of 6.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Reading German</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Knowledge of German business concepts and context</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Ability to teach German language and cultures</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Understanding spoken German</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Reading scores fell under the 4.0 mark also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Writing German (O: 3, 7, 8)**

All German majors scored 4.43.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Writing in German</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Writing scores indicate a drop from the desired 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Ability to teach German language and cultures</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Writing scores indicate a drop from the desired 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Understanding spoken German</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Writing scores indicate a drop from the desired 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Knowledge of German literature (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

All German majors scored 4.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Knowledge of German literatures</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Scores for knowledge of German literature fell under the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Knowledge of the culture of Germanic countries</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Scores for knowledge of German literature fell under the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Scores for knowledge of German literature fell under the target.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Scores for knowledge of German literature fell under the target.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Scores fell under the desired 4.0.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Scores are above the target 4.0 but are lower than 2006-2007.

**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.

**Target for O3: Writing in German**
Target Performance Level was 4.

**Target for O4: Reading German**
Target Performance Level was 4.

**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
Faculty selected a new text for the 3000 level that highlights contemporary German culture per region with accompanying DVD that features interviews with students from each region in their own dialect. Faculty also added the CTW designation to 3301 which includes multi cultural essays on topics such as xenophobia and integration of asylum seekers.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of German literature | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the culture of Germanic countries
- Reading German | Writing in German
- Knowledge of the culture of Germanic countries | Reading German | Understanding spoken German | Writing in German
- Writing German | Outcome/Objective: Ability to teach German language and cultures
- Understanding spoken German | Writing in German

Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: German faculty
Additional Resources: N/A

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 culture and listening but the scores in these two areas are lower than last year. Speaking, reading, writing, and literature for BA candidates fell under the 4.0 goal.

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
2007-2008 German MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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

SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

Institutional Priority Associations
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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.

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.

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.

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.

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
2007-2008 Gerontology MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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. Student utilize key data sources that provide gerontological information and research findings.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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. Student analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions about aging.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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).

**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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Review of Master’s Thesis
  - Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- **Implementation Description:** 12/1/07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee

**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
  - Measure: Review of Research or Administrative Internship
  - Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
- **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
  - Measure: 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
  - Measure: Review of Research or Administrative Internship
  - Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills
  - Critical Thinking Skills
- **Implementation Description:** 12/1/07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Understands student development re: Learning (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Contemporary Issues
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1. Written Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
6. Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1. Written Communication
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**
1. Written Communication
3. Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Over 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient (a score of 4). The percentage of students who achieved a rating of proficient in 2007-2008 is up 18% from 2005-2006 where 55% of students achieved a proficient rating.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

77% of students achieved a rating of 4 (Proficient). The percentage of students who achieved this standard is consistent with that from 2006-2007 (77%) and up significantly from 2005-2006 when 59% of students achieved a rating of proficient.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Over 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient (a score of 4). The rating of 70% is significantly higher than the percentage of students in 2005-2006 (48%) who achieved a rating of proficient.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient (4.0). Ratings for both 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 are higher than in 2005-2006 when 52% of students achieved a rating of proficient.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)**

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient (4.0). This is up 20% from 2006-2007 when only 53% of students attained a rating of proficient.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

A total of 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

A total of 75% of students achieved a rating of proficient (a score of 4.0).

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

A total of 63% of students achieved a rating of proficient. This is down 8% from 2006-2007 when 71% of students achieved a rating of proficient.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

A total of 80% of students achieved a rating of proficient. While this is above the criterion level of 75%, it is a significant drop (down 11%) from 2006-2007 when 91% of students achieved a rating of proficient.

### M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 10)

Supervisors’ final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10.

### Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

A total of 80% of students achieved a rating of proficient. While this is above the criterion level of 75%, it is a decline from the percentage (89%) who achieved a rating of proficient in 2006-2007.

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

#### Add assessment requirement to classes.

To improve candidates use of assessments for learning the HPE program faculty will review and add an assessment component to all pedagogy classes if necessary: KH 3010, KH 3200, KH 4510, KH 4520, KH 4530, KH 4540, KH 4710 and KH 4720. All lesson plans will require an assessment component.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006 and Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HPE Program Faculty

#### Examine content of KH 3610 and KH 4540.

Program faculty will examine content in Motor Learning and Development(KH 3610) and Instructional Models for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education (KH 4530) to determine if learning activities and assignments are appropriate and make changes when necessary.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
**Increase content knowledge on assessment for HPE.**

A new course (KH 3410 - Assessment in HPE) will begin fall 2006 that focuses on assessment strategies for health and physical education. This will improve students ability to use assessments by increasing the amount of coursework dedicated to learning assessment strategies.

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

**Increase PE technology strategies in KH 3100.**

The number of semester hours for KH 3100 (Instructional Technology for HPE) was increased from 1 to 3 effective Spring 2007. This increase in semester hours allows additional student coursework in technology strategies for physical education.

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

**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

**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

**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

**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
Review Content Knowledge Matrix.
Program faculty will review the Content Knowledge Matrix that reflects the fall 2006 program changes to determine gaps in content knowledge.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

Review current literature on class Mgt.
Program faculty will review literature about motivation and managing students and infuse additional management strategies into KH 3200 (Instructional Skills for HPE) and the Instructional Block classes (KH 4510, 4520, 4530 and 4540).

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Program Faculty

Review planning requirements in selected courses.
Program faculty will examine and discuss the current planning requirements in KH 3200, 4510, 4520, 4530, 4540, 4710 and 4720 to determine how to improve students ability to plan effectively.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

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

Implementation Description: Summer 2007
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

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

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
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

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
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty and Mike Metzler

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
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HPE program faculty

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

**Data Collection Process**
Review spreadsheet designed to tabulate STARS scores. Adjustments were made to the assignments used to determine STARS scores. The spreadsheet used to calculate scores was not adjusted to address the changes in assignments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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 re: 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:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Gurvitch, Ms. Owen, Mrs. Greene

**Evaluation of Student Competence**
Review criteria for passing students. In 2007-2008 two students did not successfully complete their student teaching. Their graduation is scheduled for fall 2008 pending successful completion of student teaching. A third student was consistently rated at the basic (level 2) or developing (Level 3) but completed student teaching and was recommended for initial teaching.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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 re: 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:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Entire HPE faculty

**Review INTASC Standards**
Review INTASC standards for Knowledge and Performance for BSE HPE majors. Over the last 3 years, there have been no students rated at the advanced level 5. Faculty will meet to discuss what criteria are used to determine competence at the advanced level.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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 re: 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:** Fall 2008
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

In 2007-2008 students in the BSE HPE program achieved the criterion level of proficiency in standards 1 (content knowledge), 9 (professional reflection) and 10 (school and community). For standard 1, the level of proficiency remained the same as in 2006/2007 at 77%. Both standards 9 and 10 were above the criterion at 80%. There was a significant increase in the number of students who achieved standard 5 (motivate and manages students for learning). There was an increase of 20% from 2006/2007 to 2007/2008 in the number of students achieving a proficient level of competence on standard 5.

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

In 2007-2008 there was a drop in the number of standards (3 out of 10 down from 8 out of 10 in 2006/2007) in which students achieved the criterion level of 75% proficiency. Standards (2,4,6) showed a decline of 4% from 2006/07 to 7%, 8% and 9% for standards 3, 7 and 8, respectively. While standards 9 and 10 were above the 75% criterion level, the 80% proficiency level achieved by students in 2007/08 is down from 2006-2007 when 91% and 89% achieved the criterion level in standards 9 and 10, respectively. This is a drop of 11% and 9% of students attaining proficiency for standards 9 and 10 respectively.
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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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the program completers met this standard indicating that they are committed to student learning and development.

| 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers reached an acceptable level of performance for this academic year.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers met the criteria for this standard.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers met the requirements for this standard.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the program completers met the target level of performance for this standard.

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

Advocacy for profession
Students will be required to create an advocacy project for their school physical education program

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund

Building collegiality
Incorporate an online discussion into EDUC 8360

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
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 4 rating | 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

Develop a matrix for the graduate program
Faculty members 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 any course overlap or omissions in content.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: HPE graduate program faculty

Develop an online delivery format for classes
The department is very concerned with getting students to complete the program in a timely manner. Since the students often have teaching and coaching obligations, traditional delivery formats make it difficult for students to enroll in classes and complete the program in a timely manner. Online delivery would decrease the time barriers that sometimes arise.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Health and Physical Education graduate program faculty

Additional Resources: Travel money to visit other programs to see how this is arranged. Release time for faculty members to transform the classes to an online delivery format

Revise requirements for action research plan
Revise the action research plan and determine the parameters that will best meet our students needs as future professionals who are informed about important issues in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Graduate students in this program did well on the five standards targeted for the program. This year's program completers were very strong students so the success was not surprising. The faculty is committed to changing the program to make it even stronger. The changes made over the past two years and the improved performance from our graduates serve as a testimony that correct decisions were made. This past year, an external review team gave the graduate program very high marks. Graduates are obtaining the jobs that they desire and are actually sought after by school districts. This past year several graduate students worked with faculty members on a programmatic research project. Results of this work will be published in a monograph in October 2008 in a Tier One publication.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
A goal for last year was completion of the graduate program matrix. Unfortunately, this was not done. A visit from an NCATE team in the fall and a program review in January required extensive time. In addition, several of the graduate faculty members were engaged in discovery of information. All of these issues sapped available time and the matrix was not completed. Plans are to complete it next year. Even though our data are strong, we still believe that we can improve the quality of the program. We will continue our search for excellence during the upcoming academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Health Administration MS
(As of 12/12/2008 03:13 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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience
Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 7: assessment of residents by HA faculty (M: 7)
assessment of residents by HA faculty in terms of final HA 8820 presentations

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience
**O/O 8: assessment of student's collaborative efforts (M: 8)**
Rating by preceptor of student’s ability to function cooperatively in the work setting

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: student evaluation of H.A. program (O: 4)</th>
<th>student evaluation of H.A. program during residency, capstone course, and on-going feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: educational assessment by students during residency</strong></td>
<td>4.0 out of a 5.0 scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas (O: 5)</th>
<th>Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas during residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: educational assessment by preceptor</strong></td>
<td>4.0 out of a rating scale of 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: SEIP ratings for H.A. courses and instructors (O: 3)</th>
<th>Electronic Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance ratings for all H.A. instructors; specifically items #35 (course effectiveness), 34, 9, and 25.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Rating of HA courses</strong></td>
<td>An overall rating of H.A. courses of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale is the desired target level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: GPA of each HA student (O: 2)</th>
<th>GPA of each HA graduate student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: percent of students in good academic standing</strong></td>
<td>3.0 or higher GPA for each student. 95% of students in each HA graduate degree program should meet the desired GPA goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: % CAHME educational content areas provided (O: 1)</th>
<th>% CAHME educational content areas provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: provide CAHME educational content areas</strong></td>
<td>100% CAHME educational content areas provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)</th>
<th>Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: assessment of residents by preceptor</strong></td>
<td>4.0 out of a 5.0 scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 7)</th>
<th>Assessment of residents by HA faculty during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: assessment of residents by HA faculty</strong></td>
<td>4.0 out of a 5.0 scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Assessment of students' collaborative efforts (O: 8)</th>
<th>Assessment of students’ collaborative efforts during residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: assessment of student's collaborative efforts</strong></td>
<td>4.0 out of a 5.0 scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improve quantitative data for measure 4**

Improve quantitative data for measure 4, which is student evaluation of H.A. program

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

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

- **Measure:** student evaluation of H.A. program
- **Outcome/Objective:** educational assessment by students during residency

- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** H.A. faculty curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Improve quantitative data for measure 7**

Improve quantitative data for measure 7, which is assessment of residents by h.a. faculty

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

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

- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty
- **Outcome/Objective:** assessment of residents by HA faculty

- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** H.A. faculty curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Improve specific content areas**

Improve epidemiology and population health content areas

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

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

- **Measure:** % CAHME educational content areas provided
- **Outcome/Objective:** provide CAHME educational content areas

- **Implementation Description:** Add to HA 8160 in Fall ’06
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HA faculty curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Health Science-Nutrition MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Division of Nutrition at Georgia State University is to prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research (M: 1)**

Demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research

**SLO 2: Demonstrate communication skills (M: 1)**

Demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills; use current and emerging technologies for information and communication to enhance the practice and delivery of nutrition care in a professional manner

**SLO 3: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans (M: 1)**

Design and evaluate nutrition care plans and interventions for health promotion and disease prevention and management for individuals and subpopulation groups based on the efficacy and strength of scientific evidence

**SLO 4: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health (M: 2)**

Comprehend the interrelationships between macro- and micronutrient intakes as they impact human health in normal and disease states

**SLO 5: Evaluate health policy (M: 3)**

Evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Capstone project (O: 1, 2, 3)
There are three possible capstone projects: thesis, project, or portfolio. Evaluation of oral communication competence is evaluated by faculty members during the defense of the thesis or project and the presentation of the portfolio. Formative evaluation of the thesis and research-focused projects for the other objectives is by rubric-guided evaluation of proposals. Final evaluation of other competencies is successful completion of the capstone experience.

Target for O1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research
Meets requirements, i.e., proficient in all areas

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the 2007/08 academic year, seven students successfully completed projects, one student successfully completed a thesis, and fifteen students successfully completed professional portfolios. The two thesis proposals that were submitted to faculty committees were evaluated by the rubric that was pilot-tested for use with thesis and research-focused project proposals last year. Proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of the beginning of student 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 the two thesis proposals submitted during the academic year. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. Proposal 1 scored 23.5/25 total, with a 2.5/5 (needs improvement) for materials and methods, based on inadequate descriptions of statistical methods employed. Proposal 2 scored 10.5/25 overall, with a proficient score only for writing mechanics. The student with the lower score did not finish a thesis, but she did complete a project. The score last year for the thesis proposal that was used to test the rubric for usability was 18/25 total, with a proficiency score for all areas. Qualitative results from the portfolio project suggest that students develop Web design skills that they do not develop in other experiences and that their reflections on their academic progress increase their satisfaction with their graduate program.

Target for O2: Demonstrate communication skills
Meets requirements, i.e., proficient in all areas

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the 2007/08 academic year, seven students successfully completed projects, one student successfully completed a thesis, and fifteen students successfully completed professional portfolios. The two thesis proposals that were submitted to faculty committees were evaluated by the rubric that was pilot-tested for use with thesis and research-focused project proposals last year. Proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of the beginning of student 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 the two thesis proposals submitted during the academic year. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. Proposal 1 scored 23.5/25 total, with a 2.5/5 (needs improvement) for materials and methods, based on inadequate descriptions of statistical methods employed. Proposal 2 scored 10.5/25 overall, with a proficient score only for writing mechanics. The student with the lower score did not finish a thesis, but she did complete a project. The score last year for the thesis proposal that was used to test the rubric for usability was 18/25 total, with a proficiency score for all areas. Qualitative results from the portfolio project suggest that students develop Web design skills that they do not develop in other experiences and that their reflections on their academic progress increase their satisfaction with their graduate program.

Target for O3: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans
Meets requirements, i.e., proficient in all areas

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the 2007/08 academic year, seven students successfully completed projects, one student successfully completed a thesis, and fifteen students successfully completed professional portfolios. The two thesis proposals that were submitted to faculty committees were evaluated by the rubric that was pilot-tested for use with thesis and research-focused project proposals last year. Proposals were selected for review because they are the first stage in applying student research methods coursework and of the beginning of student 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 the two thesis proposals submitted during the academic year. The target performance for the proposals would be proficient in all areas. Proposal 1 scored 23.5/25 total, with a 2.5/5 (needs improvement) for materials and methods, based on inadequate descriptions of statistical methods employed. Proposal 2 scored 10.5/25 overall, with a proficient score only for writing mechanics. The student with the lower score did not finish a thesis, but she did complete a project. The score last year for the thesis proposal that was used to test the rubric for usability was 18/25 total, with a proficiency score for all areas. Qualitative results from the portfolio project suggest that students develop Web design skills that they do not develop in other experiences and that their reflections on their academic progress increase their satisfaction with their graduate program.

M 2: Coursework – Advanced Normal Nutrition (O: 4)
Examinations and projects (grades) from Advanced Normal Nutrition courses
Target for O4: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health
80% or better score

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students met this objective.

M 3: Coursework -- Trends (O: 5)
Examinations and projects (grades) from Health Trends courses

Target for O5: Evaluate health policy
80% or better score

Findings 2007-2008 - 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 project 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)

Development of rubric for portfolios
A rubric for evaluating portfolios will be developed and pilot-tested for usability during 2008/9. The information from this evaluation will be used to improve the portfolio capstone experience and to improve core graduate courses.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate communication skills | Design and evaluate nutrition care plans | Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research
Implementation Description: September 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Vijay Ganji, instructor for portfolio course

Implement rubric for evaluating project proposals
The rubric for evaluating proposals was developed and tested for usability in 2006/7. It was implemented during the 2007/8 academic year for thesis proposals. It will be implemented for research-focused project proposals during 2008/9. 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:** 2007-2008  
**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 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director (Dan Benardot)

**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?**

Our review of thesis proposals showed that student performance in this area is very uneven. Overall, students who submitted thesis proposals (2 students) did not include adequate descriptions of their statistical methods, and one student did not consider compliance areas (ethical conduct of research). We will broaden this review next year by including proposals for both research-focused projects and for theses. Faculty who teach the research methods courses will increase focus on coverage of materials and methods in proposals.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2007-2008 History Assessment of Core

*(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: Comparative/global/transnational perspective (M: 1)**

Students write an essay on their final exams which analyze international or multicultural issues in historical and international 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

5 Contemporary Issues

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: student essay on final exam (O: 1)**

**Blank_In_V3**

**Target for O1: Comparative/global/transnational perspective**

90% or more students will achieve a C or better on the exam essay.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

During the spring semester of 2008, the department focused its attention on HIST 2110, the United States History survey, selecting six sections of the course to assess the goal 2.b. ("Students effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions"). Students had a choice among questions addressing the connection between U.S. civil rights and foreign policy, the history of radical thought and activism in the United States, civil liberties during World War II and the Cold War, and the cultural upheaval in the United States in 1968 in international and comparative perspective. 93% of the students in section one provided a strong answer (i.e., they scored a C or higher), 91% of the students in section two did so, 90% of the students in section three, 84% in section 4, 82% in section 5, and 85% in section 6. Following up on these findings, the department intends next year to look at the success of instructors of HIST 2110 in the inclusion of writing and primary sources.
as key components of the course. Findings in this area may further enhance our assessment of the curriculum. In addition, although most of this year’s assessment concerned the US Survey, the department also selected four sections of HIST 1112: World History since 1500 to assess goal 2.b. Students had to write in response to questions concerning the global Great Depression, the Cold War, the role of the United Nations and other international organizations in the contemporary world, and the unprecedented violence of the 20th century. In section 1, 100% of students provided a “C” answer or above, 95% did so in section 2, 90% in section 3, and 72% in section 4. In next year’s study, the department will focus on collecting more data from the World History survey.

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

**Designate new specific skills for assessment**
Identify more precisely the discipline-relevant student critical thinking skills that can be measured in assessments and can provide data for ongoing tracking of student progress.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** October 08
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshmen Studies Committee

**Establish new measurements to assess student learning**
Develop an assessment rubric for the specific critical thinking skills identified in Action 1 that can measure student progress across assignments over the course of the semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** October 08
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshmen Studies Committee

**Establish pilot program for new assessments.**
Upon completion of the new rubric during the fall semester, conduct a pilot assessment, gathering select results for fall courses to ensure the suitability of the new standards for a more thorough investigation in Spring 2009.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** October 08
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Freshmen Studies Committee

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 History BA**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 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**

5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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
4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 3)
The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art, literature, psychology, philosophy, statistics, dependant upon their area of specialization.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

### SLO 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective (M: 3)
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
5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Professional Values (M: 3)
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
4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Professional Skills (M: 3)
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
4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

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

M 2: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth (O: 2)

History majors take a senior seminar in which they prepare a research paper that uses primary sources to analyze an historical problem within an historical context.

Target for O2: Historiography

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 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. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

The Undergraduate Studies Committee (Baker, Davidson, Eskew, Poley, Reynolds, Skwiot, Venet, Wilding, Youngs) critiqued eighteen research essays, selected randomly from five sections of HIST 4990, the department's senior seminar. These papers came from courses taught in spring 2007 (two sections); summer 2007 (one section) and fall 2007 (two sections). The committee reached the following conclusions and presents them to the department. Overall, the committee was struck by the unevenness of our students' papers. Although on the whole graduating seniors are meeting upper division History Standards adopted by the department in January 2003, some seemed unclear of what constituted a research paper grounded in primary research. (The department's upper-division standards are: professional skills, historiography, interdisciplinary awareness, comparative/global/transnational perspective, and professional values.) Our students are making good use of the library resources available at Georgia State, and they are also adept at mining online resources to create papers on valuable topics. Several papers were especially impressive for the breadth of their source materials and their methods. Many of the papers indicated that our students benefit from the broader environment of the university in that they crafted papers employing interdisciplinary methods, and many also incorporated a comparative, global, and/or transnational perspective. Although some of the papers impressed the committee with their scope and level of sophistication, others were unexpectedly weak. The committee found that many students struggled to frame a topic with a clearly discernable thesis statement and to engage with the historiography on that topic. Many of the papers also suffered from various kinds of sloppiness: grammatical errors such as verb-tense jumping and passive voice constructions; imprecise language; typographical errors. Some students appear to be writing investigative journalism more than history, and did not demonstrate the kind of critical approach to their sources one would expect of a historian.

M 3: New Measure (O: 3, 4, 5, 6)

Develop new measure for objectives 3-6

Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness

To be determined

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

Measure is in development

Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective

To be determined
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?

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Preparation of coherent research paper with depth
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Historiography
- **Implementation Description:** May, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Studies 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. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Plan for improving performance on research papers

We recommend the following remedies to the shortcomings outlined in our assessment report. 1.) Faculty should work with students on the “nuts and bolts” of essay writing, including the need to craft a clearly identifiable thesis statement, to think critically about their sources, and to ground their research in existing historiography. 2) A good pedagogical method to encourage students to take a more serious approach to their research and writing is to incorporate some kind of peer review. In one section, students were required to submit a portfolio at the end of the semester which included their various drafts, the written version of their in-class presentations, the written comments they received from other students, their peer review comments on two other students’ papers, their research proposals, and other documents. The committee felt this was a very promising approach, one that should be considered by everyone who teaches this class. 3) We need to work to strengthen HIST 3000 to be sure students are acquiring the necessary skills in that class. The history department held some pedagogy workshops during the 2007-2008 academic year on HIST 3000. We hope that as we improve our teaching of HIST 3000, we will also see an improvement in our students’ work in HIST 4990. 4) We will hold additional pedagogy sessions on HIST 4990, something we will need to do anyway as we convert to the CTW framework.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Preparation of coherent research paper with depth | Outcome/Objective: Historiography
Implementation Description: April 2009
Responsible Person/Group: History dept undergraduate studies committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our students are doing well at incorporating a global/transnational perspective in their research.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Our students need to improve their ability to engage with historiography. As noted in our action plan, we will be holding pedagogical workshops to address this issue.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 History MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the program of graduate education in History of Georgia State University is to prepare students at the MA level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involved not only the mechanics of research but abetting such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the students in reading and participation in seminars, in research and analysis of primary sources, and in the presentation of the resulting finding in written and verbal formats that adhere to recognized professional standards. Graduates of GSU’s graduate History 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, 2, 3)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Historiography (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

---

**SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Collaboration

4 Critical Thinking

---

**SLO 5: Professional Values (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

2 Oral Communication

3 Collaboration

5 Contemporary Issues

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives (M: 1, 2, 3)

To avoid as far as 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Theses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

The MA thesis is meant to be an original piece of work. It is normally of more limited scope and length. Several GSU students have successfully published their MA thesis, however, this is not an expected outcome. It is also a highly individualistic piece of work that does not easily lend itself to a standardized evaluation.

**Target for O1: Professional Skill**

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining fields.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of theses. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all theses. There were considerable differences in the theses sample. Thesis A treated British history and touched on a wide range of topics including working class history, empire, and the Atlantic World; by contrast, thesis B focused more narrowly on a high school civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships' logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%
**Target for O2: Historiography**

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining fields.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of theses. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all theses. There were considerable differences in the theses sample. Thesis A treated British history and touched on a wide range of topics including working class history, empire, and the Atlantic World; by contrast, thesis B focused more narrowly on a high school civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships’ logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining fields.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of theses. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all theses. There were considerable differences in the theses sample. Thesis A treated British history and touched on a wide range of topics including working class history, empire, and the Atlantic World; by contrast, thesis B focused more narrowly on a high school civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships’ logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining fields.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of theses. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all theses. There were considerable differences in the theses sample. Thesis A treated British history and touched on a wide range of topics including working class history, empire, and the Atlantic World; by contrast, thesis B focused more narrowly on a high school civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships’ logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%

**Target for O5: Professional Values**

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining fields.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of theses. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all theses. There were considerable differences in the theses sample. Thesis A treated British history and touched on a wide range of topics including working class history, empire, and the Atlantic World; by contrast, thesis B focused more narrowly on a high school civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships’ logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%
civil rights sit-in in 1960s Chattanooga. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the theses sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): Both theses made extensive use of primary sources, for example, ships' logs for thesis A and newspapers and oral history for thesis B; thesis A was more tightly focused while thesis B was more broad but also more superficial in its analysis. Generally thesis A was a superior product but thesis B nevertheless at least met the minimum requirements. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Thesis A addressed historiography more directly and in depth than did thesis B, and thesis B engaged less directly in a debate with existing works on the subject. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Because it addressed several subfield thesis A necessarily addressed interdisciplinary questions; thesis B engaged gender theory. Outcome 4 (Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives): Thesis A drew on a wide range of literature and problems across national lines, and explained the events treated in the context of the Age of Revolutions. Thesis B made comparisons between several southern cities but did not develop these or venture outside the history of the US. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Thesis B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials. Thesis A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages: Outcome number/Thesis A %/Thesis B % 1/95/85 2/100/80 3/90/80 4/95/50 5/90/80 Outcome 1 - Thesis A - 95%

M 2: Course Work Assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

At the completion of each seminar, the responsible faculty member fill out an 11 item questionnaire on each student, ranking them from 1 (very weak) to 5 (very strong). Ten of the responses (Questions 2-11) are used for assessment. While these questions have in face been in use by the department for some time, they have never been systematically analyzed and compared. At the moment analysis is limited to the average score of all students for each question. This material should allow the department over time to identify weak area in the preparation and training of our students which can then be targeted for improvement.

Target for O1: Professional Skill

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The MA data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average MA response/Percent of "4" or above --------------- Question 2/4.35/83% Question 3/4.38/87% Question 4/4.34/90% Question 5/4.20/82% Question 6/4.20/78% Question 7/4.66/92% Question 8/4.36/80% Question 9/4.64/86% Question 10/4.30/86% Question 11/4.38/88%

Target for O2: Historiography

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The MA data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average MA response/Percent of "4" or above --------------- Question 2/4.35/83% Question 3/4.38/87% Question 4/4.34/90% Question 5/4.20/82% Question 6/4.20/78% Question 7/4.66/92% Question 8/4.36/80% Question 9/4.64/86% Question 10/4.30/86% Question 11/4.38/88%

Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The MA data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average MA response/Percent of "4" or above --------------- Question 2/4.35/83% Question 3/4.38/87% Question 4/4.34/90% Question 5/4.20/82% Question 6/4.20/78% Question 7/4.66/92% Question 8/4.36/80% Question 9/4.64/86% Question 10/4.30/86% Question 11/4.38/88%

Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The MA data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average MA response/Percent of "4" or above --------------- Question 2/4.35/83% Question 3/4.38/87% Question 4/4.34/90% Question 5/4.20/82% Question 6/4.20/78% Question 7/4.66/92% Question 8/4.36/80% Question 9/4.64/86% Question 10/4.30/86% Question 11/4.38/88%

Target for O5: Professional Values

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The MA data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average MA response/Percent of "4" or above --------------- Question 2/4.35/83% Question 3/4.38/87% Question 4/4.34/90% Question 5/4.20/82% Question 6/4.20/78% Question 7/4.66/92% Question 8/4.36/80% Question 9/4.64/86% Question 10/4.30/86% Question 11/4.38/88%

M 3: Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

An oral and/or written examination at the conclusion of coursework assesses acquisition of knowledge of specific fields or areas of history (defined either geographically or chronologically), 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

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least for of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

To date, the Department has not collected systematically on examination performance.
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.

<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>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Paper Assessment
Gather sample of research papers from Graduate Research Seminars for review by Graduate Committee and preparation of assessment report and recommendations.

<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>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Comprehensive Exam Analysis
An instrument will be prepared based on the Department’s identified Learning Outcomes to facilitate the systematic collection and analysis of data on student performance on comprehensive examinations.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2008-2009 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Differentiation of Skills
The faculty will be encouraged to more carefully differentiate responses among students

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Course Work Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Program Development
The Graduate Committee will work on developing a program to allow tracking of the work of individual students over time in each of their graduate seminars

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Theses | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives | Interdisciplinary Awareness | Professional Skill | Professional Values

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Student Evaluation Questionnaire
The questionnaire used to evaluate students in their course work will be re-written and expanded to bring it more into line with the Department’s Learning Outcomes. The specific goal for the 2008-2009 academic year is to deconstruct Learning Outcomes “Professional Skills” and “Historiography” and develop questions/measurements for the questionnaire that will address these outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Course Work Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Historiography | Professional Skill

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 academic year
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Department’s 2006-2007 report noted a change in department requirements such that all students would take at least one research seminar prior to beginning their thesis. This has been implemented.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Department's 2007-2008 assessment report indicated that there were two levels at which "it would be constructive to assess graduate student outcomes": 1 - at the course level 2 - at the thesis level. In fact, the 1008-1009 assessment calls for assessing students at three points in their graduate career: 1 - the course level 2 - the level of comprehensive examinations 3 - the thesis level. Assessment at the course level requires development of a new instrument. The Department had intended to begin rewriting the seminar questionnaire during academic year 2007-2008; unfortunately a change in Graduate directors delayed action on this. This will be undertaken in academic year 2008-2009. Tracking the performance of students over time should involve assessment both of grades received in course work and of evaluations received on questionnaires. To properly accomplish will require extended discussion among the faculty, particularly on the question of numbers assigned on the evaluations and must be seen as a long-term goal unlikely to be fully accomplished during academic year 2008-2009. The instrument for assessing comprehensive examinations will follow the five learning outcomes identified and should be relatively easy to develop. Depending on the outcome of PhD program discussions, the Graduate Committee will then proceed to examine the MA program for possible reforms.

Georgia State University
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the program of graduate education in History of Georgia State University is to prepare students at the PhD level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involves not only the mechanics of research and teaching but abetting such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the students in reading and participation in seminars, in research and analysis of primary sources, and in the presentation of the resulting findings in written and verbal formats that adhere to recognized professional standards. Graduates of GSU's graduate History 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: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 1, 2, 3)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 3: Professional Values (M: 1, 2, 3)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 4: Professional Skill (M: 1, 2, 3)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Historiography (M: 1, 2, 3)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives (M: 1, 2, 3)
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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Coursework Assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

At the completion of each seminar the responsible faculty members fill out an 11 question questionnaire on each student, ranking them from 1 (very weak) to 5 (very strong). Ten of the responses (questions 2-11) are used for assessment. While these questions have in fact been in use by the department for some time they have never been systematically analyzed and compared. At the moment analysis is limited to the average score of all students for each question. This material should allow the department over time to identify weak areas in the preparation and training of our students which can then be targeted for improvement.

**Target for O1: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The PhD data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average PhD Response

- Question 2/4.17
- Question 3/4.36
- Question 4/4.62
- Question 5/4.39
- Question 6/4.31
- Question 7/4.60
- Question 8/4.36
- Question 9/4.35
- Question 10/4.56
- Question 11/4.41

**Target for O2: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The PhD data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average PhD Response

- Question 2/4.17
- Question 3/4.36
- Question 4/4.62
- Question 5/4.39
- Question 6/4.31
- Question 7/4.60
- Question 8/4.36
- Question 9/4.35
- Question 10/4.56
- Question 11/4.41

**Target for O3: Professional Values**

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The PhD data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average PhD Response

- Question 2/4.17
- Question 3/4.36
- Question 4/4.62
- Question 5/4.39
- Question 6/4.31
- Question 7/4.60
- Question 8/4.36
- Question 9/4.35
- Question 10/4.56
- Question 11/4.41

**Target for O4: Professional Skill**

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The PhD data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average PhD Response

- Question 2/4.17
- Question 3/4.36
- Question 4/4.62
- Question 5/4.39
- Question 6/4.31
- Question 7/4.60
- Question 8/4.36
- Question 9/4.35
- Question 10/4.56
- Question 11/4.41

**Target for O5: Historiography**

Students will be rated as performing at level "4" or higher on at least seven of the ten questions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The PhD data is outlined below as follows: Question #/Average PhD Response

- Question 2/4.17
- Question 3/4.36
- Question 4/4.62
- Question 5/4.39
- Question 6/4.31
- Question 7/4.60
- Question 8/4.36
- Question 9/4.35
- Question 10/4.56
- Question 11/4.41

**M 2: Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

An oral and/or written examination at the conclusion of coursework assesses acquisition of knowledge of specific fields or areas of history (defined either geographically or chronologically), 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: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least four of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

To date, the Department has not systematically collected information on examination performance.

**Target for O2: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least four of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

To date, the Department has not systematically collected information on examination performance.
Target for O3: Professional Values

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least four of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

To date, the Department has not systematically collected information on examination performance.

Target for O4: Professional Skill

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least four of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

To date, the Department has not systematically collected information on examination performance.

Target for O5: Historiography

Students will perform at the 80% level in at least four of the five areas and no less than 70% in the remaining areas.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

To date, the Department has not systematically collected information on examination performance.

M 3: Dissertations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

A PhD dissertation is expected to involve a significant contribution to the field or subfield of history and should be considered a rough draft of a book, the most important scholarly product for historians. Thus the learning outcomes adopted by the department apply equally to MA theses and PhD dissertations but the product for the PhD is normally more lengthy, more complex and extensively researched, and more suited for reshaping into book form.

Target for O1: Interdisciplinary Awareness

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of dissertations. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all dissertations. Dissertation A, for example, treated a short period of several months of US history in one locality an was based heavily on newspaper research and government documents. Dissertation B, by contrast, looked at several countries in Europe and the US over half a century and relied chiefly on the analysis of literary works and art and architectural drawings. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the dissertation sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): In part because of its sweeping nature, Dissertation B exhibited some organizational problems; the dissertation committee suggested some possible improvements in this area and the student undertook to improve this prior to seeking publication. In one chapter of dissertation A, the student combined two generally unrelated topics, apparently because he lacked the necessary material to make either a full chapter. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Both dissertations addressed this adequately though in quite different ways: dissertation A began with a chapter dedicated to summarizing and evaluation all existing bibliography on the subject, which dissertation B wove the historiography through text, as each topic demanded. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Generally dissertation A was a straightforward narrative of a public health event, its causes, and the state's response to it; apart from the implied theories of empiricism and functionalism it was largely devoid of transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome #/Diss A %/Diss B % 1/85/90 2/90/85 3/75/90 4/60/95 5/95/95 While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.

Target for O2: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives

At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of dissertations. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all dissertations. Dissertation A, for example, treated a short period of several months of US history in one locality an was based heavily on newspaper research and government documents. Dissertation B, by contrast, looked at several countries in Europe and the US over half a century and relied chiefly on the analysis of literary works and art and architectural drawings. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the dissertation sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): In part because of its sweeping nature, Dissertation B exhibited some organizational problems; the dissertation committee suggested some possible improvements in this area and the student undertook to improve this prior to seeking publication. In one chapter of dissertation A, the student combined two generally unrelated topics, apparently because he lacked the necessary material to make either a full chapter. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Both dissertations addressed this adequately though in quite different ways: dissertation A began with a chapter dedicated to summarizing and evaluation all existing bibliography on the subject, which dissertation B wove the historiography through text, as each topic demanded. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Generally dissertation A was a straightforward narrative of a public health event, its causes, and the state's response to it; apart from the implied theories of empiricism and functionalism it was largely devoid of transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome #/Diss A %/Diss B % 1/85/90 2/90/85 3/75/90 4/60/95 5/95/95 While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.
theory. By contrast, dissertation B devoted considerable attention to literary and artistic theory, relying heavily on post-modernist approaches and textual analysis. Outcome 4(Comparative Perspectives): Apart from a single reference to experiences of the British during the Boar War and some mention of the Philippines, dissertation A does not address global or transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5(Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome #/Diss A %/Diss B % 1/85/90 2/90/85 3/75/90 4/60/95 5/95/95

While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.

Target for O3: Professional Values
At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of dissertations. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all dissertations. Dissertation A, for example, treated a short period of several months of US history in one locality an was based heavily on newspaper research and government documents. Dissertation B, by contrast, looked at several countries in Europe and the US over half a century and relied chiefly on the analysis of literary works and art and architectural drawings. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the dissertation sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): In part because of its sweeping nature, Dissertation B exhibited some organizational problems; the dissertation committee suggested some possible improvements in this area and the student undertook to improve this prior to seeking publication. In one chapter of dissertation A, the student combined two generally unrelated topics, apparently because he lacked the necessary material to make either a full chapter. Outcome 2(Historiography): Both dissertations addressed this adequately though in quite different ways: dissertation A began with a chapter dedicated to summarizing and evaluating all existing bibliography on the subject, which dissertation B wove the historiography through text, as each topic demanded. Outcome 3(Interdisciplinary Awareness): Generally dissertation A was a straightforward narrative of a public health event, its causes, and the state's response to it; apart from the implied theories of empiricism and functionalism it was largely devoid of theory. By contrast, dissertation B devoted considerable attention to literary and artistic theory, relying heavily on post-modernist approaches and textual analysis. Outcome 4(Comparative Perspectives): Apart from a single reference to experiences of the British during the Boar War and some mention of the Philippines, dissertation A does not address global or transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5(Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome #/Diss A %/Diss B % 1/85/90 2/90/85 3/75/90 4/60/95 5/95/95

While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.

Target for O4: Professional Skill
At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of dissertations. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all dissertations. Dissertation A, for example, treated a short period of several months of US history in one locality an was based heavily on newspaper research and government documents. Dissertation B, by contrast, looked at several countries in Europe and the US over half a century and relied chiefly on the analysis of literary works and art and architectural drawings. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the dissertation sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): In part because of its sweeping nature, Dissertation B exhibited some organizational problems; the dissertation committee suggested some possible improvements in this area and the student undertook to improve this prior to seeking publication. In one chapter of dissertation A, the student combined two generally unrelated topics, apparently because he lacked the necessary material to make either a full chapter. Outcome 2(Historiography): Both dissertations addressed this adequately though in quite different ways: dissertation A began with a chapter dedicated to summarizing and evaluating all existing bibliography on the subject, which dissertation B wove the historiography through text, as each topic demanded. Outcome 3(Interdisciplinary Awareness): Generally dissertation A was a straightforward narrative of a public health event, its causes, and the state's response to it; apart from the implied theories of empiricism and functionalism it was largely devoid of theory. By contrast, dissertation B devoted considerable attention to literary and artistic theory, relying heavily on post-modernist approaches and textual analysis. Outcome 4(Comparative Perspectives): Apart from a single reference to experiences of the British during the Boar War and some mention of the Philippines, dissertation A does not address global or transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5(Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome #/Diss A %/Diss B % 1/85/90 2/90/85 3/75/90 4/60/95 5/95/95

While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.

Target for O5: Historiography
At least 90% of the student work examined would demonstrate satisfactory (80% or better) in at least four of the five outcome fields and at least 75% in the remaining field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
For the academic year 2007-2008, a subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee evaluated a 40% sample of dissertations. This sample makes dramatically clear the difficulty of attempting to apply too closely a uniform standard to all dissertations. Dissertation A, for example, treated a short period of several months of US history in one locality an was based heavily on newspaper research and government documents. Dissertation B, by contrast, looked at several countries in Europe and the US over half a century and relied chiefly on the analysis of literary works and art and architectural drawings. In terms of the outcomes mentioned earlier in this report, this is how the dissertation sample fared: Outcome 1 (Professional Skill): In part because of its sweeping nature, Dissertation B exhibited some organizing problems; the dissertation committee suggested some possible improvements in this area and the student undertook to improve this prior to seeking publication. In one chapter of dissertation A, the student combined two generally unrelated topics, apparently because he lacked the necessary material to make either a full chapter. Outcome 2 (Historiography): Both dissertations addressed this adequately though in quite different ways: dissertation A began with a chapter dedicated to summarizing and evaluation all existing bibliography on the subject, which dissertation B wove the historiography through text, as each topic demanded. Outcome 3 (Interdisciplinary Awareness): Generally dissertation A was a straightforward narrative of a public health event, its causes, and the state's response to it; apart from the implied theories of empiricism and functionalism it was largely devoid of theory. By contrast, dissertation B devoted considerable attention to literary and artistic theory, relying heavily on post-modernist approaches and textual analysis. Outcome 4 (Comparative Perspectives): Apart from a single reference to experiences of the British during the Boar War and some mention of the Philippines, dissertation A does not address global or transnational topics; it does use comparative statistics regarding the incidence of epidemics at various sites within the US. Dissertation B looks chiefly at one country but does so in the context of that country's cultural and political relations to Europe and the United States. Outcome 5 (Professional Values): Both dissertations exhibit a strong awareness of professional standards of research, argumentation, and the proper use and attribution of others' work. Dissertation B demonstrated broader competence in dealing with historical research and research materials but dissertation A met at least minimum standards in most areas. Percentages are as follows: Outcome # / Diss A % / Diss B % 1/ 85 / 90 2/ 90 / 85 3/ 75 / 90 4/ 60 / 95 5/ 95 / 95 While the department generally has been successful in meeting its intended outcomes in this area of assessment, it clearly still has work to do, especially in introducing comparative/global/transnational dimensions into dissertations.

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

#### Dissertation Assessment
Review dissertations and prepare a report for review by the Graduate Committee for assessment recommendations.

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee

#### Comprehensive Exam Analysis
An instrument will be prepared based on the Department's identified learning outcomes to facilitate the systematic collection and analysis of data on student performance on comprehensive exams.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program committee

#### Curriculum Revision
PhD students will be required to take at least two research seminars.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Coursework Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skill
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program committee

### Differentiation of Skills

The faculty will be encouraged to more carefully differentiate responses among students on the evaluation questionnaire.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Coursework Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty

### Program Development

The Graduate Committee will work on developing a program to allow tracking of the work of individual students over time in each of their graduate seminars.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives | Historiography | Interdisciplinary Awareness | Professional Skill | Professional Values
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program committee

### Student Evaluation Questionnaire

The questionnaire used to evaluate students in their course work will be re-written and expanded to bring it more into line with the Department’s Learning Outcomes. The specific goal for the 2008-2009 academic year is to deconstruct learning outcomes “Professional Skills” and “Historiograph” and develop questions/measurements for the questionnaire that will address these outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Coursework Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Historiography | Professional Skill
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 academic year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program committee

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The department's 2006-2007 report noted a change in department requirements such that all student would take at least one research seminar prior to beginning their dissertation. This has been implemented.

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

The Department's 2007-2008 assessment report indicated that there were two levels at which “it would be constructive to assess (graduate student) outcomes”: 1. at the course level; 2. at the dissertation level. In fact, the 2008-2009 assessment calls for assessing students at three points in their graduate career: 1. the course level; 2. at the level of comprehensive examinations; 2. at the level of dissertations. Assessment at the course level requires development of a new instrument. The Department had intended to begin rewriting the seminar questionnaire during academic year 2007-2008; unfortunately a change in Graduate Directors delayed action on this. This will be undertaken in academic year 2008-2009. During the academic year 2007-2008, the Graduate Program committee worked on a general reform of the PhD program, which it will present to the department faculty during the Fall 2008 semester. If adopted, these reforms (outlined later) will require all PhD students to take at least 2 research seminars. More broadly, the Graduate Committee worked during the Spring 2008 semester to develop a series of reforms intended to modernize the PhD program, to bring it into line with those programs at peer institutions, and to reduce the amount of time PhD students require to complete the program. Reforms proposed for the PhD program include, among others: 1.reduce the required number of courses from 12 to 10; 2.offer a pedagogy course developed in the Department rather than relying on the School of Education for this instruction; 3.require an additional research seminar, History 7050, with a standardized curriculum that focuses on preparing the student for their dissertation research and writing; 4.reduce the number of fields required for the comprehensive examinations from 4 to 3.5.redesign and broaden the examination fields; 6.standardize comprehensive examinations to twice a year at fixed dates.
### 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  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues  
6. Quantitative Skills  
7. Technology  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students  
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources  
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources  

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.4 External Relations  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience  

#### SLO 2: Understanding of ethical standards (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students will be able to explain the ethical challenges faced in the hospitality industry and application of ethical principles in real-life business situations.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standards include a curriculum that addresses "ethical considerations."

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication  
2. Oral Communication  
3. Collaboration  
4. Critical Thinking  
5. Contemporary Issues  
6. Quantitative Skills  
7. Technology  

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation  
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources  
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources  

**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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

### 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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

### Strategic Plan Associations
4.4 External Relations
6.2 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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of various facets of hospitality law aimed at minimizing hospitality business liabilities.

Relevant Associations: ACPHA Standard: Requires that curriculum include courses that address the legal environment and ethical considerations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

---

**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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources

---

**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
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors passed the food safety and sanitation exam thereby earning a certification in this area of foodservice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For all hospitality majors to pass this written test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors passed the food safety and sanitation exam thereby earning a certification in this area of foodservice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Written performance evaluations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of HADM 4900, the required work study course, supervisors submit directly to the School formal, written performance reviews of the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Hospitality Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understanding of ethical standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Understanding of applied technology in hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Develop industry-specific specializations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Application of human resource principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Application of hospitality laws/regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Knowledge of strategic management principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.
Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

**Target for O9: Describe hospitality/tourism industry segments**

For all students to receive, at minimum, satisfactory performance reviews from their hospitality work experience. The level of knowledge application will vary depending on the industry segment and type of job that the student held.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Performance reviews from hospitality work experiences were passed with a minimum of satisfactory ratings. Employers consistently rated hospitality majors as having a sound base of knowledge and skills. In addition, comments typically indicated willingness to learn among the students, good interpersonal skills and good work habits.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2008 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2008 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2008 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2208 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2208 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2208 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2208 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Team projects are included in most required and elective hospitality courses. The 2007-2208 academic year included industry-based projects. For example, in "Hospitality Service Marketing" (HADM 3760), students worked on a marketing project with the corporate staff of Ted’s Montana Grill. In "Hospitality Strategic Management," students worked on team projects with Stone Mountain Park and Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. Other hospitality courses incorporate industry juries/judges to provide feedback on course team projects. Hospitality faculty are continually seeking and evaluating potential industry-related projects for relevancy to course learning objectives and appropriateness for resources such as time and materials.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.
**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
One hundred percent of hospitality majors successfully completed their work portfolios during the 2007-2008 academic year. The work portfolio has been revised to include a section of student work experiences related to sustainability and environmentally proactive practices or the need for such practices. The work portfolio will consistently be revised to include relevant industry issues and trends.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 98% of hospitality majors performed at a satisfactory level (minimum C grade or higher) in understanding the major knowledge competencies required by the industry.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 95% of hospitality seniors passed the exit exam with a score of 70 or higher. Further action will be to analyze the exam to ensure course content is consistent with the current exam questions.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 95% of hospitality seniors passed the exit exam with a score of 70 or higher. Further action will be to analyze the exam to ensure course content is consistent with the current exam questions.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 95% of hospitality seniors passed the exit exam with a score of 70 or higher. Further action will be to analyze the exam to ensure course content is consistent with the current exam questions.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 95% of hospitality seniors passed the exit exam with a score of 70 or higher. Further action will be to analyze the exam to ensure course content is consistent with the current exam questions.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Over 95% of hospitality seniors passed the exit exam with a score of 70 or higher. Further action will be to analyze the exam to ensure course content is consistent with the current exam questions.

**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**
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.

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.

Continue to utilize real-life industry situations

The application of knowledge from the classroom to one’s hospitality position is of vital importance.

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.

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.
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: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Course projects | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
| Knowledge of strategic management principles | Understanding of ethical standards
Measure: Written examinations | Outcome/Objective: Application of hospitality laws/regulations
| Knowledge of strategic management principles | Understanding of ethical standards
Implementation Description: By the beginning of spring semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: All HADM faculty

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

Continue to develop aviation specialization.
The aviation courses(airport management and airlines management) will be supported by providing students with more information on career opportunities available in this field. Employers in this specialization will be invited to the hospitality career fairs and a representative from Hartsfield-Jackson will be on added to the Industry Board.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: HADM 4900 Work Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Hospitality Work Experience
Measure: Written performance evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Hospitality Work Experience
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Director of School with aviation faculty

Incorporate sustainable information in courses
Current information on sustainable practices in hospitality operations will be incorporated into every hospitality course.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
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 | Understanding of applied technology in hospitality | Understanding of ethical standards
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 | Hospitality Work Experience | Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms | Knowledge of strategic management principles | Understanding of applied technology in hospitality | Understanding of ethical standards
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 | Understanding of applied technology in hospitality | Understanding of ethical standards
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 | Hospitality Work Experience | Knowledge of foodservice and culinary terms | Knowledge of strategic management principles | Understanding of applied technology in hospitality | Understanding of ethical standards
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Hospitality majors achieved most of the delineated outcomes and objectives. Majors, for the most part, achieved a minimum of a grade "C" in hospitality courses, received very positive feedback from employers, successfully engaged in industry-based team projects as well as other course team projects, were successfully certified in food safety and sanitation and successfully completed the required work portfolio.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Because scores dropped on the senior exit exam, an analysis will be conducted to make sure that the exam continues to reflect course content.

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
Regarding assessment, results showed hospitality majors are graduating with a strong foundation in needed knowledge and skill competency areas. A focus group was held at the end of spring semester 2008 to discuss programmatic strengths and weaknesses with a sample group of employers. Their feedback was very positive regarding students’ and graduates’ level of knowledge and skills sets that are valued by the industry. Faculty met regularly over the academic year starting with a full-day retreat to discuss program goals and objectives.

Contributions to the Institution
The School of Hospitality supported the University’s mission through research contributions, enhanced ties Atlanta’s hospitality industry, two new facilities that opened during the 2007-2008 academic year and continuation of international student exchanges and study abroad options.

Highlights
Highlights from 2007-2008 included two facilities that enhanced teaching effectiveness. These included the dedicated classroom located inside the Georgia World Congress Center (the Hospitality Learning Center) and the Hospitality Culinary Center - the School’s first dedicated food lab in its 35-year history. Both facilities will utilize state-of-the-art technology that will better prepare students and graduates for the industry.

Challenges
The industry demand, even with a challenging economy, continues to be strong for students and graduates. Budgetary restrictions limit faculty hiring resulting in fewer scheduled courses. Part-time instructors are utilized, to an extent, and more detailed PTI orientation materials were provided in 2007-2008. The updating of the senior exit exam will also be done for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Teaching Activities
The School of Hospitality continues to enhance learning for students by linking course material to applied "real life" business projects. These projects for 2007-2008 included: 1) Hospitality Service Marketing - Worked with Ted’s Montana Grill on marketing strategies for certain menu items; 2) Food Production and Service - Catered the opening of the Culinary Learning Center attended by over 100 industry representatives; 3) Fairs, Festivals and Event Management - Planned several on-campus events including a tailgate party, homecoming festivities and a "Healthy Eating" food festival for students; 4) Tradeshow and Meeting Management - Student teams developed complete business plans for tradeshow concepts created by the students. Project presentations were judged by industry representatives; 5) Hospitality Law - Students conducted inspections and audits of local hospitality businesses to evaluate potential liabilities; 6) Hospitality Strategic Management - Students worked with Stone Mountain Park’s management team in developing event concepts and marketing strategies to attract a more diverse population of attendees; This course also conducted a feasibility study for Hartsfield-Jackson’s Executive Conference Center in terms of other uses for the facility.

Research and Scholarly Activities
Faculty presented at major academic and industry research conferences including the International Conference for the Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education; Southeast CHRIE Research Conferences; and International Conference for Club Managers Association of America. One faculty member received a national research award. Another received local/regional media attention on a study centered on the impact of panhandling on visitor perceptions.

Public/Community Service
The School of Hospitality expanded its industry partnerships with a professional development program developed for the vending industry. Leadership positions continued with major professional associations and boards including the Atlanta Convention & Visitors Bureau, Georgia Hotel & Lodging Association, Georgia Restaurant Association, Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration and Club Managers Association of America.

International Activities
The School successfully conducted its study abroad trip during the 2008 Maymester. This trip included visits to hospitality businesses in France, Switzerland and Italy. One exchange student from the Universite de Savoie attended Georgia State fall semester 2007.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Human Resource Management MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Human Resources Management program prepares students for careers as specialists or generalists in the practice of Human Resource Management. Students are offered detailed knowledge in functional areas of recruiting, compensation, employment law, organizational development, and related Human Resources areas. Coursework provides preparation for the Human Resources Certification Institute (HRCI) examination.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Compensation System Design (M: 2)
- The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design a comprehensive compensation system that incorporates strategic alternatives, job and pay structures such as grades and bands and incentive programs, and compensation budgets.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Selection System Design (M: 3)
- Design a detailed, reliable, and valid recruitment and selection system.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Employment Law Competency (M: 4)
- Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of employment law (statutes and cases) and translate this into Human Resource policies and practices.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: HR Strategy and Effectiveness (M: 1)
- Demonstrate an understanding of how specific Human Resource practices, techniques, and policies contribute to organizational strategy and effectiveness.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 4: HRCI Exam (M: 5)
- Pass 60% of the HRCI exam without additional preparation, 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: HR, Strategy and Effectiveness (O: 5)
- Assessment tools: (1) Performance on project in MGS 8390; (2) Faculty ratings of student examinations and assignments in MGS 8300, 8320, 8360, 8390, and 8395.

**Target for O5: HR Strategy and Effectiveness**
- Target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
- Analysis and results of outcomes: (1) Poor showing in MGS 8390 projects on strategic links and effectiveness (3.1). (2) Faculty rating average from all other HR classes was 3.5.

#### M 2: Compensation System Skills (O: 1)
- Assessment tools: (1) Project in MGS 8390; (2) Graduate survey.

**Target for O1: Compensation System Design**
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target:

(1) Faculty rating: 3.3. Students improved slightly on quality of projects, but still lack detailed understanding of linkages between strategy and compensation. (2) 50% of graduates named compensation as most helpful course; 50% named it as least helpful course.

### M 3: Recruitment and Selection (O: 2)

Assessment tools: (1) Project and exams in MGS 8360; (2) Graduate survey.

**Target for O2: Selection System Design**

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

(1) Faculty rating of 3.1 on student projects. Students failed to give sufficient detail in recruitment and selection project. (2) 20% of students suggested a full-time instructor for the graduate Selection course.

### M 4: Employment Law (O: 3)

Assessment tools: (1) Project and exams in MGS 8360; (2) Graduate survey.

**Target for O3: Employment Law Competency**

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Analysis and results of outcomes: Faculty rating of 3.6 on student projects and exams in MGS 8320 and other HR courses. Feedback from graduate surveys indicated some need to increase coverage of laws pertaining to labor unions for those taking SHRM certification exam.

### M 5: HRCI Exam (O: 4)

Assessment tool: (1) Results of Human Resources Certification Institute examination.

**Target for O4: HRCI Exam**

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Analysis and results of outcomes: 3 of 4 students passed certification exam on first try. The fourth retook exam and passed on second try.

### 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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty Members

#### 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
- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty Members

#### 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
Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

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

**Compensation System Design**
Actions to be taken: Increase class time in MGS 8390 to give more detailed practice at linking compensation methods and business strategies. Emphasize strategy links in the compensation project.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Compensation System Skills
- **Outcome/Objective:** Compensation System Design

Implementation Description: December 1st 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

**Employment Law**
Actions to be taken: Continue to update court cases and new statutes and increase slightly class time devoted to labor laws.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Employment Law
- **Outcome/Objective:** Employment Law Competency

Implementation Description: December 1st 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

**HR Strategy and Effectiveness**
Actions to be taken: (1) Include 1 hour of extra instruction in MGS 8300, MGS 8320, MGS 8360, and MGS 8390 on linkages between specific business strategies and HR policies and practices.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** HR, Strategy and Effectiveness
- **Outcome/Objective:** HR Strategy and Effectiveness

Implementation Description: December 1st 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

**HRCI Exam**
Actions to be taken: Work more closely with students in preparation for the exam and provide study materials.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** HRCI Exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** HRCI Exam

Implementation Description: December 1st 2008
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty Members

**Recruitment and Selection**
Actions to be taken: Spend additional time in MGS 8360 demonstrating required detail in project. Begin using a full-time instructor in MGS 8360.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Recruitment and Selection
- **Outcome/Objective:** Selection System Design

Implementation Description: December 1st 2008
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
This year the assessment of the MS in HR was modified with a new Mission statement and a new approach to measuring. This was one to more precisely measure the skill and knowledge levels we would like to have MS students in HR to develop in contrast to those students who are taking the more general HR concentration as part of the MBA program. The MS in HR assessment focuses on a small number of students who can be followed individually. Some of the measures were altered to take advantage of this observation opportunity. The area where students showed strong performance was on HR law. They also showed will on their professional exam.

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

Areas showing some disappointment in performance were recruitment, selection and strategy. All of these have actions set out in the action plan for next year.

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

Relevant Associations: AECT Standards

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.
**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

### 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O3: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O4: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.
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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

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

Monitor Admissions
We will carefully monitor admissions to ensure that only fully qualified students are admitted.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
- Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

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 | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation

**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 | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**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 Systems Evaluation
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses Processes & Resources for Learning |

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: S.W. Harmon

Continue to Increase Online Presence
We have added several online courses over the past year and will continue to create online versions of existing courses. Ultimately we expect to have both online and face-to-face version of every course.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses Processes & Resources for Learning |

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Continue to Monitor Curriculum
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses 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 |
| Uses Processes & Resources for Learning |

Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Expand Internship Opportunities
As we grow in numbers of majors, we will need to provide more and more varied internship experiences for them. We will use our alumni and professional contacts to secure more opportunities for internships.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Increase Recruitment Efforts
We added to our overall number of students last year and will seek to expand that this year. We will actively recruit new students and maintain our high admission standards.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We maintained our high level of achievement in the preparation of our students. We have begun to attract more and stronger students as our national reputation grows. We expanded our online offerings and at the same time maintained the quality of our curriculum.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to provide more and more varied internship experiences for students. We need to continue to expand our online presence.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Instructional Technology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

Target for O3: Engages in scholarship
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

### Target for O5: Develops a professional identity
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

### Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

### Target for O7: Understands and uses technology
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

### Target for O2: Understands foundations of education
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

### Target for O3: Engages in scholarship
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

### Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.
Target for **O2**: Understands foundations of education

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

Target for **O3**: Engages in scholarship

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

Target for **O4**: Develops an extended knowledge base

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

75% of students met or achieved all standards. 4 students took comps, 1 did not pass. This student had run out his clock in the program as well.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O2**: Understands foundations of education

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O3**: Engages in scholarship

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O4**: Develops an extended knowledge base

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O5**: Develops a professional identity

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O6**: Develops leadership for the profession

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for **O7**: Understands and uses technology

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understands foundations of education**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Engages in scholarship**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Develops a professional identity**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Understands and uses technology**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100% of students defending their dissertation met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates research expertise**

100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O4: Develops an extended knowledge base
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O5: Develops a professional identity
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O6: Develops leadership for the profession
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O7: Understands and uses technology
100% of the faculty will be satisfied that reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All faculty were satisfied that syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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

Annual Review
We are instituting an annual review process in which all Ph.D. students will annually prepare and submit a brief narrative detailing their progress over the past year in scholarship, research and service.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  | 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
  Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship | Understands foundations of education
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
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 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 | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

- **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

Intensify Research Opportunities
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

### Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship

- **Measure:** Residency Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship

- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

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 2008-2009 academic year.

### Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- **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

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty in Program
Recruit Full-time Students
As we transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to recruit more full-time Ph.D. students to assist in that effort.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Standardize Cumulative Review
We instituted a cumulative review in the previous reporting period and required all students to complete it in the current period. However students used widely varying formats for reporting their accomplishments. We have hence created a standardized electronic cumulative review which we will fully implement with all students in the coming year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
By requiring all students to complete an annual review we gained insight into student trajectories in completing the program. Also, we motivated some students to become more active in their studies.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
One student did not pass the comprehensive exams. This same student had also run out his allotted time for completing the program. There appears to us to be a strong relationship between students’ steady progress in the program and their achieving the program objectives. By enforcing and standardizing the annual review we hope to insure that students make steady progress. As we continue to transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to engage our students more heavily in research. We are currently in transition from having primarily practitioner oriented students to research oriented students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 International Business MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The MIB program is designed for individuals who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership positions across functional areas in firms with significant presence or activity in international markets. The primary objectives of the MIB program are to: develop an in-depth understanding of the international business environment, extend functional skills to deal with managerial issues in the global marketplace, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, develop intercultural awareness and sensitivity, develop leadership skills to function successfully in a multi-cultural environment, develop team skills to be contributing members of an effective global team, and complete an extended work experience outside of the student's native country.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Understanding of Int’l Business Environment (M: 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Extend Functional Skills (M: 2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate expertise in a functional area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Foreign Language Proficiency (M: 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate proficiency in a non-native language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Intercultural Awareness (M: 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an improvement in their intercultural awareness and sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Team Skills (M: 5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to contribute functional expertise and serve as a productive member of a team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Extended Work Experience (M: 2, 6)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully complete an internship providing foreign business experience, cultural awareness and functional expertise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Faculty Review of Case Analysis (O: 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will assess specific projects that track the three levels of understanding at the cornerstone and capstone levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Understanding of Int’l Business Environment**

- Students should pass each project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Internship supervisor and student survey (O: 2, 6)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While students are on their functionally-based internship, we will survey the students and their internship supervisor for functionally proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Extend Functional Skills**

- Students should pass the internship portion. All students to date have passed.

**Target for O6: Extended Work Experience**

- Students should pass the internship portion. All students to date have passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Language immersion or exam (O: 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Foreign Language Proficiency**

- Students should pass the evaluation. All students assessed to date have passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Pre and post-test (O: 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will engage in a pre and post test administered before the cornerstone course and after the capstone course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Intercultural Awareness**

- Students should demonstrate improved awareness and sensitivity between the pre and post test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Capstone Project (O: 5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will engage in a team-based project in the capstone that will be self-assessed, team-assessed and faculty assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Team Skills**

- to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Supervisor evaluation (O: 6)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship supervisors will provide an evaluation at the midpoint and completion of the internship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Extended Work Experience**

- to be developed
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**develop survey**
Develop an outcome-related survey that tracks functional expertise
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and Assistant Director

**Pre and post test**
Develop process for implementing the pre and post test at the outset of the cornerstone and the end of the capstone.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and IB 8090 faculty

**projects**
Modify the projects within the cornerstone and capstone to capture and then asses the components of an understanding of international business.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Joan Gabel and Ilgaz Arikan

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Journalism BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

**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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: technology (M: 1)
Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline.
Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC, BEA

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: critical and ethical communication (M: 1)
Students will be critical and ethical communicators and consumers of communication.
Relevant Associations: NCA, AEJMC

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3070 was 69, just below the target of 70. The average for the sample of research papers in Jour 3060 was

**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.

**Target for O3: contemporary issues**
An average of 70 (out of 100) or better on the answers to ten exam questions.
Target for **O6: Industry contexts**
An average of 70 (out of 100) or better on the answers to ten exam questions.

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

#### additional measures
New measures should be considered for the curricular assessment as a single measure does not adequately assess all of the goals and outcomes. For example, the use of research papers does not adequately assess the use of technology goal.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
  - critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall semester 06
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism and Mass Communication faculty

#### goal revision
The Journalism and Mass Communication faculty plan a comprehensive review of the curriculum and one aspect will be to determine if goals should be revised, added and/or deleted.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
  - critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** January 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism and Mass Communication faculty
- **Additional Resources:** Review of peer and aspirational schools’ curricula

#### measure revision
The eight-point rubric for assessing the research paper in Jour 3070, Introduction to Theories of Mass Communication, had a high correlation with the grades assigned to research papers in Jour 3060, Mass Communication Law and Policy. The Journalism and Mass Communication faculty will consider using both measures in the future.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
  - critical and ethical communication | critical thinking | Industry contexts | technology | written and oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall semester 06
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism and Mass Communication faculty

#### Curriculum revision
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.

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

#### curriculum/assessment revision
The Journalism area faculty have nearly completed a major revision of the curriculum. The current assessment measures will be eliminated and replaced with numerous others, and some of those will be piloted this academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: exam scores | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
  - critical thinking | Industry contexts
  - Measure: research papers | Outcome/Objective: contemporary issues
new goals/objectives
The Journalism area faculty have eliminated its current goals/objectives and approved eleven new ones. These will be the foundation for the revised curriculum and its assessment. The new goals are based on the accreditation standards of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Each of the goals will hopefully have at least two assessment measures, but all of the measures may not be implemented at once. Some of the new measures will be piloted this academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
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 09
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism area faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Journalism area faculty has nearly completed a major revision of the curriculum. This year’s assessment report is based on the old curriculum. Its goals and assessment measures will not be used in the revised curriculum.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The newly revised Journalism curriculum will have new goals and assessment measures. The goals are based on the standards used by the accreditation panel of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. There will eventually be multiple measures for each goal, and a pilot of a few measures will be done in Spring 09.
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 Intra-State Moot Court Competition. We also placed third in the Saul Leffkowitz Southern Regional Moot Court Trademark Competition. In the 2005-2006 academic year, our STLA teams finished 2nd in the ABA National Mock Trial Competition, 3rd in the National Trial Advocacy Competition, 2nd and 3rd in the ATLTA Competition, and were semi-finalists in the Buffalo-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 Leffkowitz Moot Court Competition, the Jerome Prince Memorial Evidence Competition, the John J. Gibbons Criminal Procedure Moot Court Competition, and the Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition (in which they competed in the finals).

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis

Through our Moot Court and Trial Advocacy programs, we seek to utilize the students’ ability to compete in local, regional, and national forums as a method of improving their analytical, writing, and advocacy skills -- and to win as many competitions as possible. The more success our students have in competitions, the more competitions they are invited to join. Our goals are: (i) to be invited to enough quality competitions to gain national prominence (thereby increasing the reputation of the school and our students’ employment opportunities); (ii) to win or perform well in as many competitions as possible; and (iii) to afford as many of our students who wish to compete in a quality competition an opportunity to do so.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Examination and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience. 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 virtually every graduate of the College of Law. It consists of three sections: A. Essay Questions B. A Case File/Performance &

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

M 2: Annual Assessment of Externship Program (O: 1, 2)

The College of Law places students in externships at approximately 40 locations per semester. Placements include judges' chambers, state and federal agencies, and non-profit legal organizations. Two faculty members supervise the program/semester. They conduct mid-semester and end of semester interviews with each student in order to evaluate the placement. In addition, the on-site supervisor completes a lengthy evaluation of the student which the supervising faculty member reviews with the student at the exit interview. If a student does not report sufficient engagement with legal issues as part of their responsibilities, the faculty member contacts the on-site supervisor with a view to remedying the situation. This does occur, at a rate of perhaps one or two sites a year. The supervising faculty member sends each on-site supervisor a mid-semester e-mail asking them to confirm that the student extern's work is satisfactory; also, each student must have the on-site supervisor sign a form confirming that the student is on track for passing the class and must bring that form to the mid-semester interview. If an on-site director reports that a student is not fulfilling the responsibilities assigned to the student, the faculty member meets with the on-site director and with the student. If the student’s performance does not improve, the student fails. This has occurred, but only once in the last 15 years.

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis

Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

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 virtually every graduate of the College of Law. It consists of three sections: A. Essay Questions B. A Case File/Performance &

Relevant Associations: ABA Standards of Legal Education, 301, 302, 305

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

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 Intra-State Moot Court Competition. We also placed third in the Saul Leffkowitz Southern Regional Moot Court Trademark Competition. In the 2005-2006 academic year, our STLA teams finished 2nd in the ABA National Mock Trial Competition, 3rd in the National Trial Advocacy Competition, 2nd and 3rd in the ATLTA Competition, and were semi-finalists in the Buffalo-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 Leffkowitz Moot Court Competition, the Jerome Prince Memorial Evidence Competition, the John J. Gibbons Criminal Procedure Moot Court Competition, and the Georgia Intrastate Moot Court Competition (in which they competed in the finals).

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis

Through our Moot Court and Trial Advocacy programs, we seek to utilize the students’ ability to compete in local, regional, and national forums as a method of improving their analytical, writing, and advocacy skills -- and to win as many competitions as possible. The more success our students have in competitions, the more competitions they are invited to join. Our goals are: (i) to be invited to enough quality competitions to gain national prominence (thereby increasing the reputation of the school and our students’ employment opportunities); (ii) to win or perform well in as many competitions as possible; and (iii) to afford as many of our students who wish to compete in a quality competition an opportunity to do so.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Through our Moot Court and Trial Advocacy programs, we seek to utilize the students’ ability to compete in local, regional, and national forums as a method of improving their analytical, writing, and advocacy skills -- and to win as many competitions as possible. The more success our students have in competitions, the more competitions they are invited to join. Our goals are: (i) to be invited to enough quality competitions to gain national prominence (thereby increasing the reputation of the school and our students’ employment opportunities); (ii) to win or perform well in as many competitions as possible; and (iii) to afford as many of our students who wish to compete in a quality competition an opportunity to do so.

M 2: Annual Assessment of Externship Program (O: 1, 2)

The College of Law places students in externships at approximately 40 locations per semester. Placements include judges’ chambers, state and federal agencies, and non-profit legal organizations. Two faculty members supervise the program/semester. They conduct mid-semester and end of semester interviews with each student in order to evaluate the placement. In addition, the on-site supervisor completes a lengthy evaluation of the student which the supervising faculty member reviews with the student at the exit interview. If a student does not report sufficient engagement with legal issues as part of their responsibilities, the faculty member contacts the on-site supervisor with a view to remedying the situation. This does occur, at a rate of perhaps one or two sites a year. The supervising faculty member sends each on-site supervisor a mid-semester e-mail asking them to confirm that the student extern's work is satisfactory; also, each student must have the on-site supervisor sign a form confirming that the student is on track for passing the class and must bring that form to the mid-semester interview. If an on-site director reports that a student is not fulfilling the responsibilities assigned to the student, the faculty member meets with the on-site director and with the student. If the student’s performance does not improve, the student fails. This has occurred, but only once in the last 15 years.

Target for O1: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis

Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

Target for O2: Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Externship placements allow students to hone analytical and advocacy skills, to put substantive learning to practical use, and to confront professionalism issues under the guidance of an experienced mentor. The constant monitoring of the externship sites and the student externs permits ongoing assessment and adjustment with a view to ensuring a rich educational experience.

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 virtually every graduate of the College of Law. It consists of three sections: A. Essay Questions B. A Case File/Performance &
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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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 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.

Gearing up for the professional practice of law, students at Georgia State’s College of Law are prepared for a variety of career paths. 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.

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.

**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.

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

**Assess First Year Research & Writing Course**

Research and writing skills are critical to the successful practice of law. As a result, the College of Law requires all first year students to take a year long course, “Research, Writing and Advocacy.” The RWA faculty have developed a survey instrument to be administered to students who have held summer clerkships; the survey will allow the students to assess the effectiveness of the RWA curriculum in the context of their ability to perform on the job.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall [Sept.-Oct.] 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** RWA Faculty

**Assess Summer Skills Program**

In the summer before their enrollment, selected students are invited to a Summer Skills program directed at improving their chances of succeeding in law school by providing and early, intense introduction to the pedagogy of law school. This year we revamped the program. We will assess the success of the new format - in part by a Report from the Director; in part by evaluation of the student assessments; and in part by tracking the progress of the participants, and comparing it to the progress of invited students who did not attend.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Annual Assessment of Externship Program | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
  - Implementation Description: Nov. 1 for first report; tracking will be ongoing.
  - Responsible Person/Group: Director of the Summer Skills Program

**Monitor Progress of Students in the Program**

As the credentials of entering classes rise, it is our expectation that classroom and exam performance will improve, and that attrition [already slight] will diminish. In order to evaluate the students’ performance, we determine the means, medians, # of grades below 73 [a student with a GPA below 73 is not in good standing] and % of grades below 73.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Georgia State Bar Examination | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
  - Measure: Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam (MPRE) | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
  - Implementation Description: Within 45 days of the date final grades are due
  - Responsible Person/Group: College of Law Registrar and Asst. to the Registrar; Asso. Dean for Acad. Affairs

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Georgia State Bar Examination | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
  - Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
  - Measure: Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam (MPRE) | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
  - Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Jennifer Chiovaro, Director of the Legal Writing Program
Assess Summer Skills Program
In the summer before their enrollment, selected students are invited to a Summer Skills program directed at improving their chances of succeeding in law school by providing an early, intense introduction to the pedagogy of law school. In 2005-2006, a new program instructor substantially revamped the program, preparing completely new materials. We decided to try the new format for at least two years and see if we could determine the effectiveness of the 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 students from the beginning of the program to its end than has been done in the past. Students in the program have also been informally surveyed about the program’s effectiveness. The response was overwhelmingly positive, and at least left the students with greater confidence in their abilities than was previously true.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Georgia State Bar Examination | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
- Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
- Measure: Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam (MPRE) | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
- Prepare Students for the Practice of Law
- Measure: Trial and Appellate Competition Teams | Outcome/Objective: Mastering Legal Research & Legal Analysis
- Prepare Students for the Practice of Law

Responsible Person/Group: Professor Heather Slovensky

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Library Media Technology MLM
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: 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)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 1)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated content pedagogical knowledge.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction.
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning.
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning.
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection.
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning.

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 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.

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 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction.
  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 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.
  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 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment 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 10 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning.
  Responsible Person/Group: LMT program faculty
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

**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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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

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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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

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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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

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 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2007-2008
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

Maintain and monitor.
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and to continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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

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 high levels.

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.
students in other majors and the students as a whole.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

MGS students were in the 85% on Management questions in the Fall Semester falling to 80% on the Spring Semester exam.

**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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
    - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
    - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** William Bogner
- **Additional Resources:** Financial resources to hire and retain top faculty that can teach senior level courses in this area in an excellent manner so that part time instructors can be replaced.

**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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
    - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
    - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Implementation Description:** December 1st 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Managerial Sciences Faculty Members

**Revision of MGS**
Managerial Sciences needs to expand and improve its measurements. New measures have to be able to better detect the sources of the disappointing performance that MGS is experiencing relative to other students who are not Management majors. The first step in this will be having the department assessment team attend the daylong assessment workshop that the College is sponsoring on Sept 19th. Subsequently, members of the department assessment team need to apply lessons from that session and quickly develop new measures and ways of measuring. Those measures will then be implemented in the department in the 2008-09 cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
  - **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
    - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
    - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Implementation Description:** Oct 15, 2008
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** William C. Bogner

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Very Little. The assessment was unable to detect any specific strengths in the students.

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

The results are very disappointing. Students who major in Management, when tested on a range of concepts from across the field often times fare no better, and sometimes fare worse, that students in other majors in the College. The Department needs to do a better job of figure out why this is occurring by isolating those skills on which students perform poorly. Part of the challenge of doing this is that the Department contains four distinct tracks and students only have one course in common in the major.
### 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  
4. Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### 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  
4. Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

| 5.11 |

#### 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**

| 4.0/7.0 |

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

| 4.03 |

#### 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**

| 4.0/7.0 |

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

| 4.03 |

#### M 4: Apply quantitative and qualitative data (O: 1)
Students will be able use appropriate and relevant quantitative and qualitative data in the analysis of marketing problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.21</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Support decisions with data (O: 1)**
Students will provide support for their marketing recommendations with relevant and accurate quantitative and qualitative data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.06</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 affection a marketing organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Product positioning (O: 2)**
Students will be able to produce an appropriate positioning statement for a product/brand that covers target market segment,key benefits and warrant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Identify target segments (O: 2)**
Students will be able to identify appropriate target segments whose needs can be successfully served by the marketing organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Establish Measurable Objectives (O: 2)**
Students will demonstrate ability to establish measurable, achievable, relevant marketing objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand strategic marketing planning</th>
<th>4.0/7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

5.66

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

5.66

---

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

**Introduce case analysis**

The undergraduate curriculum committee will begin to encourage faculty to begin introducing case analysis exercises in all required marketing courses.

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

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

- Measure: Apply quantitative and qualitative data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Evaluate pros and cons of alternative solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Explore Alternative Marketing Solutions | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Identify actual marketing problems | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Support decisions with data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

**Introduce Marketing Math**

Encourage faculty to provide examples and problems to be solved via using marketing math as appropriate for particular course content

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

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

- Measure: Apply quantitative and qualitative data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: 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

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

- Measure: Develop a Situation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Understand strategic marketing planning

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

**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

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee
Greater Emphasis on Critical Thinking Skills
Encourage faculty to adopt class exercises and assignments that guide students into solving marketing problems via use of logical comparisons, differentiation and integration of knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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

Implementation Description: January 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

Greater Emphasis on Marketing Metrics
The Marketing Department has obtained approval to offer a required course in Marketing Metrics for all declared majors as of Fall, 2007

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Apply quantitative and qualitative data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems
- Measure: Support decisions with data | Outcome/Objective: Critically Analyze Marketing Problems

Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Assessment/Curriculum Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We have made significant progress toward improvement of most goals which we have set. This is especially true regarding goals related to student skills in the areas of analysis of situations, deployment of marketing strategy, planning, budgeting and the use of primary research.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to place renewed/greater emphasis on areas related to analytics and the use of marketing metrics. We also need to increase our efforts to train our students in critical thinking, especially with respect to linking qualitative and quantitative data to possible outcomes of strategic and tactical decisions.
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Mission / Purpose
The MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students' previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 1, 10, 11)
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.

O/O 2: Collect, Analyze and Interpret Marketing Research (M: 7, 8, 9)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to collect, analyze and interpret marketing research information for solving marketing problems.

O/O 3: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)
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, 21, 22, 23)**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 4.0, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.5, exceeding the basic requirement and meeting the goal of 3.5.

**M 3: Changes Targeted at Customers' Wants/Needs (O: 4)**
Student(s) designed new product/service or modified existing product/service targeted at customer/client's needs or wants.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation**
The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 3.33, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.75, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.50, exceeding the basic requirement and meeting 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 3.50, exceeding the basic requirement and meeting 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean score was 3.0, meeting the basic requirement.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.67, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean score was 3.33, exceeding the basic requirement.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.67, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.0, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

---

**M 13: Identify Relevant Stakeholders and Consequences (O: 6)**

Student(s) identified relevant stakeholders and consequences to each of action.

**Target for O6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mean score was 4.0, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: Proposal of Alternative Strategies (O: 6)**

Student(s) proposed alternative strategies consistent with evaluation.

**Target for O6: Recognize and discuss ethical issues**

The mean rating for student projects will exceed 3.5 on a 5 point scale, where 1 = Does not meet requirement; 2 = Partially meets requirement; 3 = Meets basic requirement; 4 = Exceeds requirement; and 5 = Significantly exceeds requirement.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.0, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Segmentation Analysis (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) applied segmentation analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean score was 3.33, exceeding the basic requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) chose viable target market(s)/positioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.0, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Impact of Competition (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) determined impact of competition on firm's actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.33, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Differences between domestic and intl environments (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) identified differences between domestic and international marketing environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Differences between domestic and intl processes (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) identified differences between domestic and international marketing processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: ability to draft international marketing plan (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student(s) demonstrated ability to draft international marketing plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.75, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 21: Identification of Relevant Rights at Issue (O: 6)**

Student/identifiers 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 3.67, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 22: Identify Relevant Stakeholders and consequences (O: 6)**

Student/identifiers identified relevant stakeholders and consequences of each 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean score was 4.0, exceeding both the basic requirement and the goal of 3.5.

**M 23: Identify differences between domestic and intl mkt (O: 6)**

Student/identifiers identified differences in ethical issues between domestic and international markets

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The mean score was 3.0, meeting the basic 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
- **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**: Realistic 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)

**Improve Inter-rater Reliability**

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...
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.

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.

Scholarship-Sharing Series

Sponsor an S-Cubed session focusing on best practices within the department relative to enhancing student learning outcomes.

Analysis of Quantitative Skills

The faculty has recently been informally discussing student abilities related to quantitative analysis. One area that needs clarity is to identify whether students (1) lack sufficient capability to perform quantitative analysis or that rather (2) students do not effectively communicate the results of their quantitative analysis. Of course there could be deficiencies in both areas. This action item calls for a discussion of how to better understand students’ quantitative skills.
**Communication of Assessment Results**

Provide each faculty member, who provided student materials to be assessed, with the results of that assessment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan  
  - Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

**Improve Inter-Rater Reliability**

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:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan  
  - Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008/Spring 2009  
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

**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:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - Measure: ability to draft international marketing plan  
  - Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

As outlined in last year's assessment section, we continue to address a set of challenges somewhat specific to our situation. We are assessing learning outcomes for our MS in Marketing students. This is a relatively small program, with our students taking classes within the context of the flexible MBA program. There are several challenges in making definitive statements concerning student learning outcomes for this group. (1) The assessment will often be based on a very small sample size. This was particularly true this time around. We are assessing MS students in three courses: marketing research, international marketing and strategic market planning. The bulk of the assessment relies on group projects – we assess any group project from any of the three courses that has one or more MS students as group members. Even with such a broad net, this report is based on only 3 projects and one individual assignment. This raises two issues – one discussed in last year’s analysis, which is that the work of the MS student(s) is part of the overall team effort. The second issue is the small number of assessment projects and assignments. Our students continue to demonstrate competence on the majority of the performance objectives measured. Sixty-five percent 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 65% of the mean scores, compared with the 2006/2007 report, showed improvement. About 30% dipped and 5% showed no change. Finally, the learning objective scores for the overall team effort. The second issue is the small number of assessment projects and assignments. Our students continue to demonstrate competence on the majority of the performance objectives measured. Sixty-five percent 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 65% of the mean scores, compared with the 2006/2007 report, showed improvement. About 30% dipped and 5% showed no change. Finally, the learning objective scores for the overall team effort. The second issue is the small number of assessment projects and assignments. Our students continue to demonstrate competence on the majority of the performance objectives measured. Sixty-five percent 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 65% of the mean scores, compared with the 2006/2007 report, showed improvement. About 30% dipped and 5% showed no change. Finally, the learning objective scores for the 2007/2008 assessment compare favorably with the same scores for the 2006/2007 assessment. For this assessment cycle, we have also expanded the scope of materials assessed. We added materials relating to ethical issues from 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, we will continue to communicate the results of the assessment process to faculty members (which was initiated last year,) 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.
Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students demonstrated this ability in the fall 2007 semester.

M 2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students demonstrated this ability in the fall 2007 semester.

M 3: Leadership & Organizations 1 (O: 1)
Students will be able to identify theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 52 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability, while 44 percent partially demonstrated the ability, while just 4 percent did not master the ability.

M 4: Leadership & Organizations 2 (O: 1)
Students should be able to explain their own leadership styles and abilities

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 52 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability, while 48 percent partially demonstrated the ability. None did not master the ability at all.

M 5: Leadership & Organizations 3 (O: 1)
Students will be able to analyze specific managerial dilemmas in their own working environment.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 72 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability, while 24 percent partially demonstrated the ability, and just 4 percent did not master the ability at all.

M 6: Research Methods & Statistics 1 (O: 1)
Students will become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 59 percent of students fully demonstrated this familiarity, while 25 percent partially demonstrated the ability, and 16 percent did not master the ability at all.

M 7: Research Methods & Statistics 2 (O: 1)
Students will develop skills using the computer to perform basic statistical 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 59 percent of students fully demonstrated this familiarity, while 25 percent partially demonstrated the ability, and 16 percent did not master the ability at all.

M 8: Research Methods & Statistics 4 (O: 1)
Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 59 percent of students fully demonstrated this familiarity, while 25 percent partially demonstrated the ability, and 16 percent did not master the ability at all.

M 9: Microeconomics 1 (O: 1)
Students will learn about the market economy.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 78 percent of students fully demonstrated this understanding, while 22 percent partially demonstrated the understanding, with none not achieving the understanding.

M 10: Microeconomics 2 (O: 1)
Students will learn the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 65 percent of students fully demonstrated this understanding, while 31 percent partially demonstrated the understanding, and just 4 percent did not demonstrate the understanding at all.

M 11: Public Service 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall 2007 semester, 83 percent of students fully demonstrated the ability to describe the historical development of public administration thought in America. Less than 15 percent of students partially demonstrate such skill, while just 2 percent did not master this skill.

M 12: Public Service 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
In the fall 2007 semester, 83 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability. Less than 15 percent of students partially demonstrated this ability, while just 2 percent did not master the ability.

**M 13: Public Service 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
In the fall 2007 semester, 85 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability. Less than 13 percent of students partially demonstrated the ability, while just 2 percent did not master the ability.

**M 14: Research Methods & Statistics 5 (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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The course with these objectives was not taught in the fall 2007 semester.

**M 15: Research Methods & Statistics 3 (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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
In the fall 2007 semester, 59 percent of students fully demonstrated this familiarity, while 25 percent partially demonstrated the ability, and 16 percent did not master the ability at all.

**M 16: Research Methods & Statistics 6 (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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The course with this objective was not taught in the fall 2007 semester.

**M 17: Microeconomics 3 (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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
In the fall 2007 semester, 75 percent of students fully demonstrated this ability, while 22 percent of students partially
demonstrated the ability, and 4 percent did not demonstrate the ability at all.

**M 18: Management Systems 1 (O: 1)**

Students will be able to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks as they apply to public and nonprofit sectors.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The course with this objective was not taught in the fall 2007 semester.

**M 19: Management Systems 2 (O: 1)**

Students will learn advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.

**Target for O1: Core Requirements**

Instructors evaluate students on a three-point scale, where 1=skill not demonstrated, 2=skill partially demonstrated, and 3=skill fully demonstrated. Our goal is for 90% of students to fully demonstrate the skill. We consider the target partially met if 90% of students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The course with this objective was not taught in the fall 2007 semester.

**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
- **Measure | Outcome/Objective:**
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | 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
- **Measure | Outcome/Objective:**
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | 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 the following months.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- **Measure | Outcome/Objective:**
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 1 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
  - Measure: Public Budgeting & Finance 2 | Outcome/Objective: Core Requirements
- **Implementation Description:** March 30, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All PAUS faculty

**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.
MPA Re-accreditation

During the 2007-2008 school year, a self-study of the MPA program was completed, submitted, and reviewed by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, the national MPA accrediting body. NASPAA representatives also conducted a site visit of the GSU program, then recommending full re-accreditation. That re-accreditation is anticipated sometime in the 2008-2009 academic year.

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.

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.

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.

MPA Committee

A committee of MPA faculty met on an ongoing basis during the 2007-2008 school year, as stipulated in the previous action plan, to evaluate and improve the MPA curriculum. The committee’s efforts resulted in major modifications of the core curriculum, which will take effect and be reflected in the 2008-2009 WEAVE report. In the coming year the committee will also review content of the MPA curriculum. The committee’s efforts resulted in major modifications of the core curriculum, which will take effect and be reflected in the 2008-2009 WEAVE report. In the coming year the committee will also review content of the MPA curriculum.
Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary
MPA faculty have been active in evaluating progress and working to achieve goals, completing an extensive review of the curriculum during this academic year. 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 2007.

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.

Challenges
The MPA program continues to be challenged by a difficult market for students. A contracting public sector combines with many other MPA programs in the area to limit the number of new students. However, MPA faculty continue to work to identify new markets for quality students.

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 2007 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 MPA program offers 4 international programs for students to study abroad(1)An exchange with the Department of Politics at University of Northumbria, Newcastle, UK. We typically have 3 or 4 students studying at Northumbria one term each year. This program was initiated in 2004. Students may transfer 12 hours of credit back to GSU. (2) An exchange program with the MPA Institute at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. This is the first year of the program and its structure is similar to the program at Northumbria. (3) A three week study abroad program in Strasbourg, Brussels and Paris. Students visit European Union organizations and receive 3 hours of credit. This program is presently in its second year. (4) A semester long study abroad in Strasbourg where again the focus is on the EU. We hope to begin this program during the Fall of 2009. Another area of international collaboration is with the University of Barcelona, Spain. Together with GSU’s Center for Ethics and Corporate Responsibility (Robinson College of Business) we hosted a visit from students from Barcelona’s Master’s Degree in Social Economy and Management of Non-Profit Organizations. Our students
were able to meet these students and participate in seminars on environmental sustainability conducted by major Atlanta organizations such as Coke and HomeDepot. We will host a similar group again in 2009.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The general education learning outcomes at Georgia State University are a product of a series of policy decisions and accompanying practices that have shifted the conversation about undergraduate student learning from a content focus within each department to an emphasis on shared responsibilities for teaching and assessing those skills which provide the framework for content and tools for lifelong learning. Georgia State University's general education policy was approved in February of 2004 when the University Senate adopted the current general education learning outcomes: written communication, oral communication, collaboration, critical thinking, contemporary issues, quantitative skills, and technology skills. These skills are seen as central to Georgia State University's Mission "to provide access to quality education for diverse groups of students, to educate leaders for the State of Georgia and the nation, and to prepare citizens for lifelong learning in a global society." 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. "Basic quantitative literacy depends on students being introduced to the foundations of quantitative reasoning and then given reinforcement experiences which develop and deepen in the student the habits of thinking which the student has been encouraged to develop. Taking one course is not enough to endow a student with a habit of mind, but completing a carefully devised program can provide sufficient practice to make a pattern of thought part of the student's intellectual tools. The construction of such a program requires leadership from the mathematics faculty and other faculty as well as commitment to the three other major points of this report." (From the Preface of Quantitative Reasoning for College Graduates: A Complement to the Standards, Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM), MAA.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Interpret mathematical models (M: 1)
Interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables, and schematics, and draw inferences from them.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 2: Multiple representations of information (M: 1)
Represent mathematical information symbolically, visually, numerically, and verbally.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 3: Arithmetic proficiency (M: 1)
Use arithmetical, algebraic, geometric and statistical methods to solve problems.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 4: Appropriateness of solutions (M: 1)
Estimate and check answers to mathematical problems in order to determine reasonableness, identify alternatives, and select optimal results.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 5: Limitations (M: 1)
Recognize that mathematical and statistical methods have limits.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: QL quizzes (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Pre/Post testing of student abilities basic quantitative literacy. Our idea was to test during the first week, middle of the semester as well as at the end. This would tell us the length of time associated with their learning. We have currently implemented the first two weeks and end of the semester quizzing. Regular course embedded assessments are used for the "middle of the semester" time. We intend on studying how to improve this by tracking those students that progress through lower level sequences.

Target for O1: Interpret mathematical models
50% Response rate 70% Success rate

Target for **O2**: Multiple representations of information
50% Response rate 70% Success rate

Target for **O3**: Arithmetic proficiency
50% Response rate 70% Success rate

Target for **O4**: Appropriateness of solutions
50% Response rate 70% Success rate

Target for **O5**: Limitations
50% Response rate 70% Success rate

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

It has been decided after reviewing previous years’ data and discussion of appropriateness that it is more appropriate to include a Pie Chart problem than the Marathon Problem. This change has been made and distributed to the course coordinators for fall. In the future, the “Betty and Wilma” problem will be aligned with the “Ducks and Cows” as both require utilizing linear system of equations (as it is in the above tables). As can be readily seen from the tables above, the “Betty and Wilma” problem (on the Post QL) is found to be more difficult by students than the “Ducks and Cows” problem (on the Pre QL). After reviewing some students’ solutions, the error most common is the conversion of a decimal hour to minutes. Also, unlike MML which gives partial credit on this problem for the correct number of hours, ULearn would mark this completely wrong if either part is incorrect. It is also interesting to see that 1101 and 2211 students had more difficulty with the Pie Chart problem than they did with the Marathon problem. This further supports our decision to change out the Marathon problem. Though probability is not a topic covered in these four classes, it is rewarding to see improvement on this question at the end of the semester (except for 2211 students). Further (qualitative) analysis needs to be done in order to determine if the basic problem solving skills that are developed during the class or the diagram for the Probability question that led to this improved student performance on this question. It is interesting to note that the two classes that had formal Problem Solving Activities (1111 and 1113) often outperformed students in 2211.

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

Problem solving skills need to be address in 1101 and 2211. See the Complete QL report.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Mathematics BS**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 PM EST*

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

---

**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
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

---

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
### 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
2. Critical Thinking
3. Contemporary Issues
4. Quantitative Skills
5. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2. 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 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

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2. 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Critical thinking (M: 1, 2, 3)
This is a General Education Outcome.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4. Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2. 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Quantitative skills (M: 2, 3)
This is a General Education Outcome.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6. Quantitative Skills

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2. 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Contemporary issues (M: 2, 3, 5)
This is a General Education Outcome.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5. Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2. 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6. 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 8: Technology (M: 2, 3, 5)
This is a General Education Outcome

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**
6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Uniform Assessment (M: 1)
Develop a more uniform and equitable assessment plan in all of the core courses.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### O/O 10: Technology - Core (M: 4)
Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to the discipline.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Quantitative Literacy Quizzes (O: 1, 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 O1: Uniform Assessment**
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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical thinking</th>
<th>Quizzes are administered to 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students. An overall 70% &quot;Success Rate&quot; is the target. A 50% Response rate is the target.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Homework and Projects (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Apply techniques to solving applied problems</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Written communication</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical thinking</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O6: Quantitative skills</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O7: Contemporary issues</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O8: Technology</td>
<td>80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to the desired learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Class participation and individual contact (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Apply techniques to solving applied problems</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Written communication</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical thinking</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O6: Quantitative skills</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O7: Contemporary issues</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O8: Technology</td>
<td>Active class participation is expected of all students. Individual contacts are encouraged; preferably, 80% or more students would take advantage of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Technology Projects (O: 9, 10)</td>
<td>Students use technology (such as MAPLE and MATLAB) to solve problems and communicate the results of these investigations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, LaTeX is introduced and students must typeset at least one project report using LaTeX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Quantitative Literacy - Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rating of 70%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Technology - Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rating of 70%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Presentations (O: 4, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student is required to give at least one presentation in class on a mathematical topic of his/her own choice. The format of the presentation may involve use of overhead projector, slides or writing on the whiteboard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Written communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Contemporary issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</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
- Measure: 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

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006

**Responsible Person/Group:** Valerie Miller

**Improving instruction involving applied problems**
By nature, applied problems are more complicated to solve, since one must be able to understand the background information to formulate the problem into a mathematical question first. It is time consuming to present real world examples that require a lot of background information from other areas. However, to help students do better in solving applied problems, the department must begin to spend a little more time on this in most mathematics courses, such as Math 2211, Math 2212, Math 3435, and Math 4435.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Class participation and individual contact | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Contemporary issues | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology | Written communication
- Measure: Homework and Projects | Outcome/Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
- Contemporary issues | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology | Written communication

- **Implementation Description:** 2007
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Johan Hattingh

---

### Introduction to mathematical software

Appropriate technology, such as MATLAB, MAPLE or graphic calculator, should be introduced and demonstrated in class. Students should be asked to do some homework problems and/or projects using technology.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Class participation and individual contact | Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
    - Contemporary issues | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology | Written communication
  - Measure: Homework and Projects | Objective: Apply techniques to solving applied problems
    - Contemporary issues | Critical thinking | Quantitative skills | Technology | Written communication

- **Implementation Description:** 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Johan Hattingh
- **Additional Resources:** All upper level math classes should be taught in classrooms with computer facility.

---

### 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
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Valerie Miller

---

### 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
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Valerie Miller

---

### 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Objective):**
  - Measure: Quantitative Literacy Quizzes | Objective: Critical thinking

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Valerie Miller

---

### 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 | Objective):**
  - Measure: Homework and Projects | 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
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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 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.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14)
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: 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

O/O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 1, 7, 9, 15, 16)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

O/O 5: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 8, 15, 17)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

O/O 6: Works collaboratively with parents/community (M: 18, 19)
Works collaboratively with parents and community.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 3: Recognizes individual differences in students (O: 1)**
Recognizes individual differences in her/his students and can adjust practice accordingly

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 4: Has an understanding of how students develop (O: 2)**
Has an understanding of how students develop and learn

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 5: Treats students equitably (O: 1)**
Treats students equitably, through understanding fairness.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 6: Values the whole student (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 7: Appreciates how knowledge field is created (O: 4)**

Appreciates how knowledge in his/her field is created, organized and linked to other disciplines

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 8: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

Uses specialized knowledge to promote 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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Generates multiple paths toward 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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 10: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development (O: 1, 2, 3)
Uses multiple methods to promote 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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: 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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: 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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 16</strong>: 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: 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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 17</strong>: 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: 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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 18</strong>: Works collaboratively with parents (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works collaboratively with parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Works collaboratively with parents/community</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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 19</strong>: Takes advantage of community resources (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes advantage of community resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Works collaboratively with parents/community</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>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed first full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The addition of EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics has broaden the understanding of diversity in the mathematics classroom. Also, the Action Research project in EDMT 7560 provided a method for teachers to develop their abilities of using data from their classroom/students to inform instruction.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Currently, there are no further action plans, the program just completed its first full year in the program redesign. The impact of the redesign will continue to be monitored.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: 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 2: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

O/O 3: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

O/O 4: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 7)
teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

O/O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 8)
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

O/O 6: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

O/O 7: Involves School and Community in student learning (M: 10)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

O/O 8: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

O/O 9: Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

O/O 10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 8)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O8: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.5% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.5% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.7% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.5% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.9% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
83.6% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
88% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
86% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
90.5% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: summer 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

### Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 5 rating | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Implementation Description: summer 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

### Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor and address the observed needs of diverse learners during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Implementation Description: summer 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

### Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor 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 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning
- Implementation Description: summer 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

### Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, systematically document data collected, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning
- Implementation Description: summer 2006
- Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

### Modify sequence of activities

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year. Faculty across methods and technology courses have modified their syllabi and discourse collaboratively for improvement in the academic 2006-2007.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
- Implementation Description: summer 2006
Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify sequence of activities
School and Community Involvement: We will modify the syllabi and discourse in the student teaching practices in the spring semester. Students understand and acknowledge the value of school and community but lack practice.
  Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 10 rating | Outcome/Objective: Involves School and Community in student learning
  Implementation Description: summer 2006
  Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

Modify Syllabi and Discourse
Monitor the content and methods courses taken. Continue to modify syllabi and discourse in the methods courses to meet the needs of teachers and their students.
  Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
  Implementation Description: summer 2006
  Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

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 7 rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction
  Implementation Description: summer 2007
  Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

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

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. Implementing the reflective teaching and learning models are dependent on the relationships between student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor.
  Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
  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 2007
  Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty

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. Implementing the reflective teaching and learning models are dependent on the relationships between student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor.
  Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection
  Implementation Description: summer 2007
  Responsible Person/Group: Teacher Alternative Preparation Program Faculty
Modify sequence of activities
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. Faculty across methods and technology courses will maintain their collaboratively for improvement.

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: 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

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 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

Will maintain and monitor sequence of activities
Understands student development re: learning
Will maintain and modify the syllabi
Course and activities’ development.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning

Implementation Description: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS

Will maintain and monitor
Involves School and Community in student learning

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty

Will maintain and monitor activities
Practices professional reflection

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 9 rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will maintain and monitor activities
Understands and uses assessment for learning

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will maintain and monitor sequence of activities
Can effectively plan for instruction

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will maintain and monitor sequence of activities
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will maintain and monitor sequence of activities
Can motivate and manage students for learning
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will maintain and monitor sequence of activities
Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

Will modify sequence of activities
Uses communication skills and technology

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: 2008-2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of TEEMS program

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. These outcomes are reflected in our STARS data assessments. There were a few students who were consistently weak throughout the program because of personal situations and not the lack of ability.

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 significant improvement in the TEEMS program. 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 student learning outcomes during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Mathematics MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Show skills to collect data. (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students should have the skills to collect data.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 2: Show computer skills. (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students should be familier with some major statistics computer packages, such as SAS, S-plus.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 3: To read and understand the research articles. (O: 1)</td>
<td>Students should be able to read and understand the research reports/articles in statistics.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate Analytical Skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 4: To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 4)</td>
<td>Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 5: Analyze and interpret data through proofs. (O: 4)</td>
<td>Students should be able to analyze and interpret data through either proofs or algorithms.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 6: Show effective written communication. (O: 5)</td>
<td>Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 7: Show key knowledges in statistical theories. (O: 2)</td>
<td>Students should articulate key mathematical/statistical concepts and theories.</td>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written</strong>&lt;br&gt;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>Measure-Outcome/Objective Combination</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Know the update knowledges in statistics. (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 9: Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving.</strong></td>
<td>This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 10: Understand research problems. (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Students show the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 11: Show an appreciation for history of mathematics. (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 12: Demonstrate numerical competency. (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Students demonstrate numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 13: See connections across fields. (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 14: Develop a mathematical intuition. (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 15: Draw conclusions from data. (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Students show the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 16: Extend solution methods. (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 on a 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 17: Explain ideas to nonspecialists. (O: 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students show the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written**

At least 3 on a 4 point scale.

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

**Evaluation at thesis defense.**

For each thesis student, the thesis committee will evaluate all seven measures of achieved student program outcomes on a 5 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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Middle Childhood Education MEd**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% were at or above level

**M 2: Faculty STARS standard 2 rating (O: 2)**

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

**Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
<th>100% were at or above level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**  
100% were at or above level

**M 4: Faculty STARS standard 4 rating (O: 4)**  
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**  
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**  
100% were at or above 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**  
100% were at or above level

---

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

**Maintain and monitor**  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **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  
- **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  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty in Mathematics and Science

**Program continuation for Math and Science**  
The Mathematics and Science MCE MED options will continue as the numbers of certified teachers interested in pursuing these
options is slowly but steadily increasing. The plan is to double the current number of program completers.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: Summer 2009
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 current students enrolled in the program were 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 were supported to meet the outlined goals and objectives.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Middle Grades Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 9)
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

SLO 2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 2)
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

SLO 3: Understands student development re: learning (M: 3)
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

SLO 4: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 10)
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

SLO 5: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 5)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

SLO 6: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 6)
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

SLO 7: Practices professional reflection (M: 7)
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

SLO 8: Involves school and community in learning (M: 8)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 4)</td>
<td>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 1)</td>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O10: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 10)</td>
<td>Supervisors’ final evaluations, course grades and portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.</td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
<td>69.7% (23 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to the knowledge and use of multiple instructional strategies. 100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to the knowledge and use of multiple instructional strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
<td>100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to content pedagogical knowledge. 81.8% (27 out of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to content pedagogical knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Understands student development re: learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
<td>100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to understanding student development specifically for learning. 72.7% (24 out of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to understanding student development specifically for learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</strong></td>
<td>75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
<td>100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to effective teaching of diverse learners. 66.67% (22 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to effective teaching of diverse learners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Faculty STARS Standard 7 rating (O: 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
54.55% (18 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to effective planning for instruction. 100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to effective planning for instruction.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to the understanding and use of assessment for learning. 51.52% (17 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to the understanding and use of assessment for learning.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to the use and practice of professional reflection. 75.76% (25 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to the use and practice of professional reflection.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to the involvement of the school and community in learning. 51.52% (17 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to the involvement of the school and community in learning.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
66.67% (22 of 33) TEEMS MCE MA/SC students demonstrated the target performance related to student motivation and management for effective learning. 100% (10 of 10) TEEMS MCE LA/SS students demonstrated the target performance related to student motivation and management for effective learning.
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 course 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.

To increase quality of content courses MA/SC
Traditionally, content courses have been taken in the mathematics department and have not been aligned well with current reform expectations for teaching mathematics. Relevance of content to the middle school philosophy is critical.

Examine and revise rubric for student assessment
In MCE TEEMS LA/SS - given the high success rate of completers using the current rubric these measures and objectives should be reassessed to develop a more discriminating rubric and/or rigorous program coursework.

Increase recruitment/retention
To increase enrollment in program, efforts will be made to revise the department website, increase program visibility through emails to listserves, and recruitment through GSU undergraduates and other public outlets, such as printed brochurs. In addition, orientation sessions will be offered to all new MCE TEEMS LA/SS students to help them successfully navigate the program and understand program requirements.
Review of Program Alignment with INTASC Standards

In MCE TEEMS MA/SC -- Given the below target of completers with regard to several INTASC standards, Faculty will undertake a review of course and program experiences as to how they explicitly target INTASC Standards. Faculty will ensure that these goals are explicitly targeted in current experiences

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- 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 9 rating | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: MCE TEEMS MA/SC Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

All completers for MCE TEEMS LA/SS met the target performance expectations for measures 1-10. MCE TEEMS LA/SS students demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, teaching performance, and ability to impact student achievement. They are engaged in professional growth and participate in learning communities. The MCE TEEMS MA/SC faculty have worked hard to strengthen the content experiences and competencies of students entering the program. This attention to quality content advising is seen in the 82% of students meeting the content standard. New courses introduced in the 2007/2008 school year should reflect even greater numbers.

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

The high levels of success for the MCE TEEMS LA/SS program on the (100% (10 of 10) students met the outcomes and objectives at very high levels (100%) of accomplishment) indicate the need for a more discriminating assessment rubric and/or increased rigor in program objectives and/or coursework. Several standards reflect areas of improvement regarding the preparation of students. Specific cause for concern are standards 6, 7, 8, and 10 in which percentages are slightly above 50%. This is a relatively large program with students represent various recruitment strategies and backgrounds. The experiences across the program given such variation may not be the same.
Interpersonal communication is assessed regularly in the classroom using task-based exercises such as interviews, surveys, and information-gap activities. The activities reflect the Communicative Objectives of each lesson and require language knowledge, use of communication strategies (e.g., turn-taking, asking for clarification, etc.) and cultural awareness. Since this is done several times during the semester, it is considered formative assessment.

**Target for O1: Oral 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Students learning a foreign language (FL) (as opposed to a second language (L2)) need to be motivated and involved in their own development. But motivation cannot be enough, at some point there needs to be Willingness to communicate (WTC).

**Presentational communication (O: 1)**

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.

**Target for O1: Oral 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Analysis of oral communication as measured by three oral assignments was assessed with an internally-developed oral communication rubric suggest that oral communication needs to have more prominence in the communicative classroom. Instances of students missing one, two and even three oral assignments show some disregard for this aspect of their language learning.

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

**Develop fluency**

These results will be used to identify the best tasks for the classroom to increase fluency, an aspect often overlooked in first-year classes. It is expected that the information will help develop lessons on formulaic sequences, paraphrasing, and other real language strategies that are usually neglected in the lower-level language classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Interpersonal communication | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
  - Measure: Presentational communication | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lower Division Spanish instructors

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Students who recorded all assignments and listen to themselves, received more guidance regarding Spanish phonology. There is an indiscernible gap between what students hear and what they produce. In order to bridge the gap, L2 learners have to be able to perceive their own mistakes and teachers have to be able to provide reasonable suggestions to repair them.

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

Oral production evaluation has been neglected in the communicative classroom and pronunciation has been relegated to some repetition exercises in the laboratory activities manual of current first-year Spanish textbooks. Given the importance of pronunciation and intonation in the perception of proficiency it is admirable the absence of any mention of it in more textbooks. Our intuition is that students need to record and listen to themselves often to overcome pronunciation problems.
**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. During 07-08, the program had approximately 80 students; 35 students graduated with master’s degrees in MSD from Summer 07 through Spring 08.

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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, social, and personal development.

Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 9: Practices professional reflection (M: 9)**
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
Relevant Associations: INTASC/NCATE/PSC/CEC

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
With an N of 82, 89% 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**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 82, 90% 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
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 82, 92% 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 practicum 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
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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
With an N of 82, 88% 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
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 82, 91% 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
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 82, 91% 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
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
With an N of 82, 91% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With an N of 82, 89% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With an N of 82, 92% 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**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

With an N of 82, 92% 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** January 2007. Has been successfully implemented.
- **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 Standart that the lesson addresses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** January 2007. Has been successfully completed.
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** June 2007. Has been implemented. New data collection system in place.
- **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: Finished
Priority: Low

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. Has been implemented and new data collection system is in place.
Responsible Person/Group: MSD Program Coordinator

**Continue to Monitor and Evaluate Data**
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. We will also consider using other ratings beyond STARS for our weaveonline reporting.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

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: May 2009. This is implemented and new data system in place.
Responsible Person/Group: MSD 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 positive with 7/10 standards met at 90% or higher and the other 3 standards met at 88% or 89%. The overall mean of all of the standards was at 91%.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
For the 07-08 assessment cycle, the MSD faculty made some revisions in target levels for measures used to determine achievement of student learning outcomes. The MSD faculty increased the target level of achievement from 75% to 90%. Even with this increase, the target level of achievement was met for 7/10 standards. Although three were not met at 90% or higher, they were all at 88% or above. For the 2008-09 assessment cycle, the MSD faculty will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2007-2008 Music Assessment of Core

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the core undergraduate curriculum in music is to provide comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic courses which introduce learning concepts and skills that prepare students to think critically in the pursuit of artistic knowledge.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Assessment of Critical Thinking in MUA 1930/3930 (M: 1)**
Assessment was determined by how well students obtained critical thinking skills in MUA 1930/3930 (Music in Society and Culture). These include (1) understanding music in culture; (2) interpreting music as culture; (3) integrating musical and cultural analyses.

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, GA Professional Standards Commission
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication

Institutional Priority Associations
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical thinking in core (O: 1)
Students were asked to write essays (about 500 words) from the following choices. These were: 1. “During the first half of the 20th century, certain composers “chose” to be modern (avant-garde), while others preferred to be “followers of the past”. Discuss their stylistic differences. Explain the consequences it had on audiences. Mention some composers of each group.” 2. “Two figures dominated the opera world during the second half of the 19th century. Their ideas about the significance of opera, about music in general, and even about life were completely different. Start by identifying these two composers and their nationalities. Then, explain why opera was such an important form of entertainment in the 19th century. Next, discuss the two composers' styles and explain how they became associated with the taste, the traditions, and even the “flavor” of their respective countries. Include the titles of some of their operas.”

Target for O1: Assessment of Critical Thinking in MUA 1930/3930
80% of students will earn a "C" or better on their on the essays. Two-thirds will earn "B" or better.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Of the 56 registered students (91%) earned a C or higher and 41 (73%) earned a B or higher with 20 A’s, 21 B’s, and 5 C’s.

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

Improve the specifics of assessments
Develop learning outcomes and a rubric for assessment to offer more particular data for ongoing tracking of student progress.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical thinking in core | Outcome/Objective: Assessment of Critical Thinking in MUA 1930/3930

Implementation Description: Spring of ’09
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty involved in teaching core

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Grades continue to improve on the essays.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
It may be necessary to continue develop a rubric-based ratings system for the essays.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Music Bachelors
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University, and that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music (M: 6, 10)
Perceives, analyzes, and explains the theoretical structure of music in styles nad genres from pre-Renaissance through
contemporary eras, and demonstrates independent synthesis of this knowledge when listening, creating, and performing

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music Ga Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Contemporary Issues
3. Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Faculty
2. Facilities
3. Technology
4. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Places music in historical and cultural context (M: 7)**
Places Western and non-Western music in historical and cultural context

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Faculty
2. Facilities
3. Technology
4. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Technology in listening, performing, creating (M: 5, 9)**
Uses appropriate applications of technology in listening, creating, and performing music

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Faculty
2. Facilities
3. Technology
4. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Performs in ensembles and as a soloist (M: 8)**
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**
1. Written Communication
2. Contemporary Issues
3. Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Faculty
2. Facilities
3. Technology
4. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Composes and improvises music (M: 4)**
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**
1. Collaboration
2. Critical Thinking
3. Contemporary Issues
4. Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Faculty
2. Facilities
3. Technology
4. Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies (M: 1, 3)**
Demonstrates functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

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: 2)
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
3 Collaboration

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 8: Knowledge and skills for career development (M: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge, synthesis, skills, problem-solving, and application consistent with careers relevant to a selected concentration within the School of Music
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.2 Facilities
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
7 of 7 students in MUS 4480 scored a C or higher with 3 A’s and 4 B’s. 16 of 16 students in MUS 4490 scored C or higher with 16 A’s.

M 2: Teaching music (O: 7, 8)
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 student teaching

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in student teaching reached satisfactory or better performance in Spring 2008.
### Target for O8: Knowledge and skills for career development

80 percent of students achieve satisfactory or better progress in student teaching.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in student teaching reached satisfactory or better performance in Spring 2008.

### M 3: Piano and conducting proficiency (O: 6)

Students demonstrate satisfactory or better proficiency in Piano IV (MUS 2720) and Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) as indicated by rubric-based grades.

### Target for O6: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies

80 percent or better of students demonstrate satisfactory, excellent, or outstanding performance in functional keyboard and conducting as evidenced by rubric-based grades of C or better on final evaluations.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

- In MUS 2490, 11 of 12 students (91.6%) received a C or better with 10 A`s, 1 B and 1 WP.
- In MUS 2720, 24 of 28 students (85.7%) received a C or better with 6 A`s, 13 B`s and 5 C`s.

### M 4: 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 4210.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

- In Mus 3010, 15 of 15 enrolled students received a C or better with 9 A`s, 3 B`s and 3 C`s.
- In Mus 4210, 9 of 9 enrolled students scored C or higher with 5 A`s and 4 B`s.

### M 5: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

- 22 of 24 enrolled students (91.6%) passed with a C or higher with 10 A`s, 10 B`s and 2 C`s.

### M 6: 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

- In Theory IV, 36 or 41 enrolled students (87.8%) scored a C or higher with 5 A`s, 12 B`s and 19 C`s.

### M 7: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

- In History II, 22 of 24 enrolled students (91.6%) scored a C or higher with 12 A`s, 7 B`s and 1 C.
- In World Music, 9 of 14 enrolled students (64.2%) scored a C or higher with 5 A`s and 2 B`s. It should be noted that 4 students withdrew, 3 with a WP grade.

### M 8: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Continued systematic review indicates that the standard of excellence in the ensembles and breadth of composers, styles,
M 9: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Due to sabbatical this course was not taught last year. MUS 4982/6982 is as reasonable a predictor. In that class of 6 enrolled students, all 6 received a grade of C or higher with 3 A's and 3 B's

M 10: Semester juries (O: 1)

Each student is rated on his or her 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

244 juries were performed in SP08. Of these 234 advanced and 10 were retained. This is an advancing rate of nearly 96%.

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

Critical Thinking Assessment

Periodic meetings will be held of the humanities(core) music faculty during the fall semester of 2006 in order to finalize the critical thinking course content and assessment methodology. Implementation of any curricular or instructional changes will take place during the spring semester of 2007.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: January 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Marva Carter

Improve learning outcomes and rubrics

Increase faculty use of measurable student learning outcomes and rubrics in courses and for non-course requirements, e.g., juries, recitals, exit projects, etc.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
- Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
- Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
- Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
- Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | 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

Implementation Description: AY07
Responsible Person/Group: faculty; ad hoc assessment committee
Additional Resources: Sufficient faculty in SOM to provide incentives and release time for this additional service

Targeted assessments

Select targeted areas, e.g., technology, conducting, etc., for more focused longitudinal assessment of student progress

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
- Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
- Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
- Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
- Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | 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
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: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | 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

Implementation Description: 5.1.08
Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty and/or ad hoc committee
Additional Resources: Dedicated/release time

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Technology proficiency
Measure: Semester juries
Measure: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency
Measure: Music History and World Music
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting
Measure: Repertoire analysis
Measure: Satisfactory completion of Theory IV
Measure: Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music
Measure: Teaching music
Measure: Technology proficiency

Implementation Description: 5.1.08
Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty and/or ad hoc committee
Additional Resources: Dedicated/release time

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: Advanced computer for music technology students | Outcome/Objective: Technology in listening, performing, creating
Measure: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | 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

Implementation Description: 5.1.08
Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty and/or ad hoc committee
Additional Resources: Dedicated/release time to accomplish the necessary tasks

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: Analysis of improvisation and composition | Outcome/Objective: Composes and improvises music
Measure: Music History and World Music | Outcome/Objective: Places music in historical and cultural context
Measure: Piano and conducting proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies
Measure: Proficiency in advanced conducting | 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

Implementation Description: 5.1.08
Responsible Person/Group: SOM administration and faculty and/or ad hoc committee
Additional Resources: Dedicated/release time to accomplish the necessary tasks
### Improve Learning Outcomes on Syllabi

Clearer articulation of learning outcomes and related assessments on syllabi and their alignment with GSU and SOM outcomes, will assist determinations of progress.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced computer for music technology students</td>
<td>Technology in listening, performing, creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of improvisation and composition</td>
<td>Composes and improvises music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music History and World Music</td>
<td>Places music in historical and cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano and conducting proficiency</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in advanced conducting</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire analysis</td>
<td>Performs in ensembles and as a soloist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory completion of Theory IV</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester juries</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching music</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills for career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology proficiency</td>
<td>Technology in listening, performing, creating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 5.1.08  
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOM administration and faculty and/or ad hoc committee  
**Additional Resources:** Dedicated/release time

### 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:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced computer for music technology students</td>
<td>Technology in listening, performing, creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of improvisation and composition</td>
<td>Composes and improvises music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music History and World Music</td>
<td>Places music in historical and cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano and conducting proficiency</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in advanced conducting</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire analysis</td>
<td>Performs in ensembles and as a soloist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory completion of Theory IV</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester juries</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching music</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills for career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians</td>
<td>Technology proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology proficiency</td>
<td>Technology in listening, performing, creating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 5.1.09  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All SOM faculty and administration  
**Additional Resources:** Release time would be needed. This action was listed in the 2006/2007 report. To our knowledge, no work has been completed on this. The SOM will undergo NASM evaluation next year which will tax the faculty greatly. A target date of May 2010 is realistic.

### Targeted Assessments

Incorporate assessment data into SOM database.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced computer for music technology students</td>
<td>Technology in listening, performing, creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of improvisation and composition</td>
<td>Composes and improvises music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music History and World Music</td>
<td>Places music in historical and cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano and conducting proficiency</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in advanced conducting</td>
<td>Functional keyboard and conducting proficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire analysis</td>
<td>Performs in ensembles and as a soloist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory completion of Theory IV</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester juries</td>
<td>Demonstrates theoretical understanding of music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching music</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills for career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing music with lay audiences and musicians</td>
<td>Technology proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** 5.1.10  
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOM Committee would need to be formed  
**Additional Resources:** Release time would be needed. This action was listed in the 2006/2007 report. To our knowledge, no work has been completed on this. The SOM will undergo NASM evaluation next year which will tax the faculty greatly. A target date of May 2010 is realistic.
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

It appears that the School of Music is admitting students who have a strong chance of being successful in the program. The outcome measures used seem to cover all facets of the music major.

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

Achievement in academic subjects is, on the whole, less strong than in performance areas. This may be due to students having greater competency in the performing area or it may be due to uneven assessment between the two areas. This is an issue the School of Music should seek to address.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Music Masters**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University, and that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Applications of technology (M: 6)**

Demonstrates accurate applications for 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

---

**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

---

**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

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.1 Faculty
- 4.2 Facilities
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience
- 6.7.1 Financial Support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates research skills in music and advanced understanding of the literature and repertoire appropriate for his or her concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission</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>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Historical-cultural understanding in context (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates advanced historical-cultural understanding of music from one or more historical periods and in global context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission</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>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates advanced levels of understanding and skill for teaching music in studio, classroom, and community settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission</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>4.4 External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 90% of students (41/43 in Spring 08) achieve A or A- on end of semester juries. More than 80% (30/37 in 07-08 AY) receive A on recitals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis (O: 3)**

Student evidences analytical ability at satisfactory or higher levels in analysis of both tonal and post-tonal music

**Target for O3: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/28 (86% of students achieved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Research skills/knowledge of literature (O: 4)**

Courses, recital repertoire, and exit projects indicate very good or better knowledge of research skills and literature

**Target for O4: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86% of students demonstrate achievement in research classes; more than 90% achieve in recital repertoire and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**M 4: Historical-cultural understanding of music (O: 5)**
Students demonstrate satisfactory or better achievement in relevant course work as indicated by rubric-based grading

**Target for O5: Historical-cultural understanding in context**
90 to 95 percent of students achieve at the very good or outstanding levels in relevant course work

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
85% (17 of 20) achieved B or better in music history classes

**M 5: Individual and class teaching skills (O: 6)**
Students evidence satisfactory or better progress in pedagogy classes and other course work related directly to teaching, as indicated by rubric-based grades

**Target for O6: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts**
90 to 95 percent of students achieve very good or outstanding ratings in coursework and/or experiences directly related to music teaching

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
86% (19/22) achieved

**M 6: accurate application of technology (O: 1)**
Student demonstrates satisfactory or better achievement on relevant courses and projects as indicated by rubric-based assessment/grades

**Target for O1: Applications of technology**
90 to 95 percent of students achieve very good or outstanding ratings on technology-specific courses and technology-related projects

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
2/2 (100%) of students achieved

---

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

**Rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes**
Continue to develop rubrics and measurable student learning outcomes for more precise assessment; will require professional development for faculty unaccustomed to these items

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology
  - Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context
  - Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts
  - Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
  - Measure: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill
  - Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

- **Implementation Description:** AY 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** faculty and ad hoc assessment committee
- **Additional Resources:** Time release is essential -- it is impossible to complete this work given the workloads of faculty in the school of music

**Student Portfolios**
Begin process of electronic portfolios for students based on program objectives

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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology
  - Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context
  - Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts
  - Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
  - Measure: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill
  - Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

- **Implementation Description:** AYO 07
- **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: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
- Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: AY07
Responsible Person/Group: faculty and ad hoc assessment committee
Additional Resources: Release time, sufficient faculty in SOM to cover loads as well as these additional expectations

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: Finished
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology
- Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context
- Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts
- Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
- Measure: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill
- Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: 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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: accurate application of technology | Outcome/Objective: Applications of technology
- Measure: Historical-cultural understanding of music | Outcome/Objective: Historical-cultural understanding in context
- Measure: Individual and class teaching skills | Outcome/Objective: Teaching in diverse settings and contexts
- Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
- Measure: proficiency in tonal and post-tonal analysis | Outcome/Objective: Advanced analytical knowledge and skill
- Measure: Research skills/knowledge of literature | Outcome/Objective: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: 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: On-Hold
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

Reduce Incompletes
Students who do not achieve A on recital typically receive an I (which is then changed to A). An earlier commitment to repertoire may reduce the number of cancellations.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Juries and public performances | Outcome/Objective: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: applied faculty

Reduce withdrawals
If fewer students withdrew, desired outcome would have been met. In most cases, one less withdrawal would have been sufficient (sample sizes are small)
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **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**: Research skills/knowledge of literature | **Outcome/Objective**: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge

Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: N. Lee Orr, Steven A. Harper

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

We are very close to meeting all objectives. If fewer students withdrew from classes, we would have met all. The sample sizes are very small; in most cases, one or two fewer Ws would have been sufficient to meet the target.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Nursing BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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 (BFLSON) is to: educate nurse clinicians, practitioners, scholars, educators, leaders, and researchers; develop health-related community partnerships; and engage in research and other forms of scholarship. This education is provided in a multi-cultural urban setting, and is accomplished through a unique professional and academic interdisciplinary environment. This community-focused approach enriches student learning, fosters leadership development, and furthers the pursuit of science. The BFLSON admits 56 students twice a year and graduates approximately 100 students a year.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Standards of Professional Nursing (M: 13)**

Apply current standards of professional nursing practice in providing care to individuals, families, groups, and the community.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Value of Professional Commitment (M: 4, 5)**

Demonstrate an awareness of the value of professional commitment.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Collaborate (M: 7)**
Collaborate with individuals, families, groups, the community and other health care providers to maximize positive health patterns.

Relevant Associations: CCNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students |

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 4: Respect for Diversity (M: 8)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for human diversity when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Associations: CCNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff |
| 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students |

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 5: Sociopolitical, economic, and ecological forces (M: 6, 9)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate knowledge of the effects of sociopolitical, economic and ecological forces on nursing and provision of health care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Associations: CCNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students |

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 6: Ethical and legal issues (M: 1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate knowledge of ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Associations: CCNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students |

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 7: Nursing Research (M: 2, 3)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate knowledge from nursing research in caring for individuals, families, groups and the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Associations: CCNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 9: Critical Thinking (M: 10, 14)**
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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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 4510, NURS 4610) in the section: incorporate knowledge of the ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students received a grade of satisfactory in the section: incorporate knowledge of the ethical and legal issues in providing nursing care.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students completing NUR 3500 obtained a grade of C or better for SP 2008, SU 2008 and F 2007.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
Data on graduates is not available as this time.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
35% of the juniors and seniors were eligible for membership in Sigma Theta Tau International.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
Data on graduates is not available at this time.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students received a grade of satisfactory in the section: Incorporate their knowledge of the effects of sociopolitical, economic and ecological forces on nursing and the provision of health care.

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 4510, NURS 4610) in the section: The student will engage in multidisciplinary activities.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students received a grade of satisfactory in the section: The student will engage in multidisciplinary activities.

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 4510, NURS 4610) in the section: The student will assess clients in a holistic process.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students received a grade of satisfactory in the section: The student will assess clients in a holistic process.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the student taking NUR 3300 in F 2007 received a grade of C or better. 99% of students taking NUR 3300 in SP 2008 received a grade of C or better.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

97% of the May 2008 and August 2008 graduates completed the standardized critical thinking exam. Of these 84.28% received a passing score on their first attempt.

**M 11: NCLEX (O: 8)**

NCLEX first time pass rates

**Target for O8: Knowledge of self, science and humanities**

85.5% of the graduates of the undergraduate generic program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As of the last official GA Board of Nursing report dated 12-31-07 our first time pass rate was 96.05. Of our graduates since that time we are aware of 106 takers with 104 passing for a rate of 98%. This is an unofficial first time pass rate for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 graduates.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

53% of the graduates of the undergraduate program met or exceeded the established passing score on the exit exam on the first attempt. 89% met or exceeded the score by the third attempt. 11% were not successful in meeting the established passing score on the exit exam.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

99% of students received a grade of satisfactory in the section: Demonstrate application of current standards of professional nursing practice.

**M 14: Critical Thinking Through Writing (O: 9)**

Graduates who enter the program in Fall 2009 or thereafter will take two critical thinking through writing courses.

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking**

100% of the graduates will complete the two designated critical thinking through writing courses (NUR 2080 and NUR 4600).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Pilot testing of the CTW courses began in Spring 2007 in both NUR 2080 and NUR 4600 and it still in progress. The CTW faculty have met and reviewed the assignments and have revised as needed. 100% of the graduates for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 completed at least one CTW course.

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

**Alumni Data**

An alumni survey has been developed and IRB approval has been obtained to do data collection on a variety of factors related to our graduates. The survey will be administered by phone contact.

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

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

- **Measure:** Alumni Nursing Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Nursing Research
- **Measure:** Professional Nursing Organization Involvement | **Outcome/Objective:** Value of Professional Commitment

**Implementation Description:** December 2006.
**Responsible Person/Group:** Krista Meinersmann, Bridget Doerr, and Cathy Gebhardt

**Critical Thinking**

The results of the critical thinking assessment for the December 2005 and May 2006 graduates needs to be compiled.
  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 Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee Curriculum Task Force

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: NURS 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 scored.

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

Clinical Evaluation Tool
Re-evaluate the way the clinical evaluation tool is currently structured and used to determine if this is the best way to assess the identified outcome measures.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 2010
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate program taskforce on the clinical evaluation tool

Critical Thinking Exam
The critical thinking exam has been tied to a beginning level course (2040) and a senior level course (4610) to improve completion rates and performance.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: UPC, Administrative Coordinator, Associate Director, course faculty

Critical Thinking Through Writing
Implementation of the critical thinking through writing courses continues. The pilot data from this semester will be evaluated by the course faculty to see if the process needs to be refined.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking Through Writing | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Implementation Description: December 2008 and May 2009
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors, CTW ambassador, Associate Director/CTW Coordinator

Exit Exam
For 2007-2008 we implemented a pilot program that uses a different preparation method for the exit exam. The pilot needs to continue and be fully evaluated for effectiveness at the end of the 2008-2009 school year.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of self, science and humanities

Implementation Description: May 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee; Associate Director

Tracking of Alumni
Follow-up survey data on alumni has not been consistently collected. A program evaluation committee was formed in Spring 2008 and is revising the process for tracking all assessment processes. One of the areas being addressed is tracking of graduate data. We have also expanded the role of one academic professional to include alumni relations. This will allow for better tracking of graduates so follow-up surveys can be sent more efficiently.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Task Force, Associate Director, Assistant Director External

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments reveal that our graduates are continuing to do very well and that our first time pass rate on the NCLEX remains over the 90% mark. This is an overall indicator that our graduates are prepared for their careers as professional nurses and that the program is providing the needed preparation. Another area that demonstrates progress toward our outcomes is the piloting of the critical thinking through writing courses. While the University initiative will require implementation for all students entering in Fall 2009, the School of Nursing is well on its way to full implementation. We are in our second full year of piloting the courses and are continuing to refine the assignments. The faculty are supportive of the initiative and dedicated to making improvements as needed to improve the outcomes.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The assessments show that we continue to fall short of our goal in the area of the exit exam pass rates. However, of the 14 students who did not pass the exit exam, even after three attempts, 12 passed their NCLEX. 1 has not taken it yet and 1 we do not know about. This indicates that our exit exam process is being successful in that it is helping identify students at risk of failing the NCLEX. Each
student who fails the exam for the third time is required to work with the Associate Director of the Undergraduate program to develop a detailed study plan that will assist them in being prepared for the exam. Several of the students who were in this category have shared with faculty that the detailed plan helped them to be prepared for the exam. Overall, the target is not being met but the aim of the process is being met and that is success on the NCLEX. The other area that continues to be problematic is follow up with alumni and employers. Several steps have been taken this year to improve our tracking of alumni and their employers and we anticipate that follow up will improve.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2007-2008 Nursing MS

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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 Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

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 Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Participation in Research (M: 4, 5, 9)
Engage in research to support and promote nursing knowledge and to improve advanced practice nursing

Relevant Associations:

- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Collaboration in Provision of Health Care (M: 3, 12)
Collaborate with individuals, families, communities and others for the purpose of providing nursing care and promoting health and wellness.

Relevant Associations:

- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- National Organization of Nurse Practitioners
- American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health)
- National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
- National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and
Neonatal Nursing Specialities

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Health Care (M: 3, 5, 13)**
Analyze the influence of socio-political, economic, and ecological forces on nursing practice, health, health care delivery, and health care providers.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

**SLO 6: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing (M: 6)**
Incorporate knowledge of legal and ethical issues in advanced practice nursing.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

**SLO 7: Professional Commitment (M: 3, 4, 5, 14)**
Demonstrate professional commitment.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

**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 Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

**SLO 9: Theory as a Basis for Advanced Practice Nursing (M: 8)**
Evaluate concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced practice nursing

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners American Nurses Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health) National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and
**Neonatal Nursing Specialities**

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Some of the certification bodies do not give us reports regarding certification. We have data from two certification boards reporting on 8 students; all of them passed their certification exam (100%).

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Data not available at this time.**

#### 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. 15% of the graduating advanced practice students will report accepting an advanced practice position at the time of graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Fifteen (40.5%) of our Spring 08 graduates had accepted an advanced practice position in their specialty area prior to 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. 15% of the graduating advanced practice students will report accepting an advanced practice position at the time of graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Fifteen (40.5%) of our Spring 08 graduates had accepted an advanced practice position in their specialty area prior to 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. 15% of the graduating advanced practice students will report accepting an advanced practice position at the time of graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Fifteen (40.5%) of our Spring 08 graduates had accepted an advanced practice position in their specialty area prior to 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. 15% of the graduating advanced practice students will report accepting an advanced practice position at the time of graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Fifteen (40.5%) of our Spring 08 graduates had accepted an advanced practice position in their specialty area prior to 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. 15% of the graduating advanced practice students will report accepting an advanced practice position at the time of graduation.
**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Fifteen (40.5%) of our Spring 08 graduates had accepted an advanced practice position in their specialty area prior to 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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:**
Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met
100% of the students enrolled in clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical advanced practice nursing as evidenced by successful completion of the clinical practice portion of the courses. Alumni data not available at this time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

15 students were inducted into Sigma Theta Tau International (Nursing’s Honor Society) and 3 students received awards; recognition and awards were given to 12% of the students.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Twenty-five (25/29; 86.2%) students indicated that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing for advanced nursing practice. Alumni data not accessible at this time.

**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 are prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Fifteen (15/29; 51.7%) students indicated that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-four (24/29; 82.7%) of the graduating students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective to integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced practice nursing.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-four (24/29; 82.7%) students indicated that they met/exceeded the 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. All graduating students will successfully demonstrate that they collaborate with the client, family, and community in their practica.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-three (23/29; 79.3%) 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-three (23/29; 79.3%) students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective for analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-four (24/29; 82.7%) students indicated that they met/exceeded the 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 caring in nursing practice.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-six (26/29; 89.6%) students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Twenty-five (25/28; 89.2%) 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
**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.

1. Action plan will be delayed until all data can be accessed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

For the most part we met our objectives. Our graduates are prepared to practice as advanced practice nurses. Other measures indicated that they are satisfied with the program.

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

Measures for some of the items are difficult to obtain. We are evaluating the masters program this year and may revise some of the measures for next year.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Nursing PhD**

(As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 PM EST)

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

**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)

**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)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Human Environments Interactions &amp; Health Promotion (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Issues Affecting the Conduct of Research (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examine issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (M: 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing</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**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Presentations at Professionals Meetings (M: 10, 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit abstracts for scholarly presentations at professional meetings</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Submission of Manuscripts (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit manuscripts for consideration for publication</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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Publication of Manuscripts (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.</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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Funded Research (M: 8, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit proposal for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and/or dissertation research.</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 6: Completion of PhD Program (M: 7)**

Complete PhD program requirements

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 11: Leadership Recognition (M: 10, 11, 12, 13)**

Graduates will be recognized through awards, honors, activities in professional organizations, etc.

Relevant Associations: American Association of Colleges Of Nursing: Indicators of Quality Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing (November, 2001)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.4 External Relations

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Implementation of Socially Relevant Research (O: 1)**

Students and alumni will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

**Target for O1: Implement Socially Relevant Nursing Research**

100% of PhD students and 30% of the alumni who respond to 1-, 3-, and 5-year surveys will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Five students graduated between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008. All graduates (100%) completed studies on topics of social relevance in the 21st century. Of the six alumni responding to the surveys, two (33.3%) reported that they had funded research.

**M 2: Theory, Research and Vulnerable Populations (O: 2)**

Students will link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations.

**Target for O2: Theory & Research with Vulnerable Populations**

90% of students will link theory and research to health issues in N8100 Vulnerable Populations.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Ten (100%) students successfully completed N8100 Vulnerable Populations, demonstrating their ability to link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations.

**M 3: Human Interactions & Health Promotion (O: 3)**

Students will analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration in NURS 8100

**Target for O3: Human Environments Interactions & Health Promotion**

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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Ten (100%) students completed N8100 Health in Vulnerable Populations, thus demonstrating their ability to analyze the relationships among human-environment interactions and health promotion, protection, and restoration.

**M 4: Issues in the Conduct of Research (O: 4)**

Students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.

**Target for O4: Issues Affecting the Conduct of Research**

100% of students will address issues such as race, gender and class in conducting research.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students in N8050 (N=13) and N8051 (N=11) addressed issues including race, gender, and class as they constructed research studies for a class assignment. Twelve students successfully completed N8050 and eleven students successfully
M 5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (O: 5)

Students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework.

**Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

90% of students will explore diverse modes of inquiry in doctoral level coursework.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students in N8012 Qualitative Methods (N=10; 100%) and N8050 (N=12; 92.3%)/N8051 (N=11; 100%) Quantitative Research Methods III explored diverse modes of inquiry as they used qualitative and quantitative approaches in the development of research studies.

M 6: Application of Research Methods to Nursing Topics (O: 5)

Develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.

**Target for O5: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

100% if students who progress to dissertation will develop and apply a methodology appropriate to phenomena/research questions related to the discipline of nursing.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Five (100%) doctoral students implemented research methods appropriate to the phenomena of interest; all studies were related to the discipline of nursing (e.g. theory testing related to the importance of the relationship between the primary care physician and the patient with HIV; nurses`practices of screening for elder abuse; the effectiveness of computerized teaching and "hands on" practice in ACLS certification).

M 7: Completion of PhD Program (O: 6)

Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD degree in nursing.

**Target for O6: Completion of PhD Program**

80% of students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

In Fall 2007, 42 doctoral students were enrolled in courses. At the end of Spring 2008 semester, 40 students were enrolled; two were lost to academic attrition. Forty students (40/42; 95%) were progressing toward completion of the doctoral program. Five (5/40; 12.5%) graduated during the course of the year.

M 8: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (O: 10)

Students and alumni will submit proposals for internal or external funding to support doctoral coursework and/or dissertation research.

**Target for O10: Funded Research**

30% of the students will apply for internal or external funding (i.e. scholarships, NRSA awards, etc.) to support doctoral course work and dissertation projects. 10% of the students applying for funding to support doctoral work will be successful in obtaining funds. One third (30%) of the alumni who respond to 1-, 3-, and 5-year surveys will indicate that they have received funding for research.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the 10 students enrolled in the dissertation course, 4 submitted proposals for research funding. Three (75%) have received funding. Of the six alumni responding to the surveys, two (33.3%) reported that they had funded research.

M 9: Submission of manuscripts for publication (O: 8)

Students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty/colleagues, for publication.

**Target for O8: Submission of Manuscripts**

30% of the students will submit manuscripts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for publication.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the 10 students who have successfully completed the required courses (not including dissertation research course) in 07-08, 3 (30%) submitted an article for publication.

M 10: Professional Presentations (O: 7, 11)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

completed N8051.
Of the doctoral students who responded to a survey about accomplishments, 10 (100%) indicated they had presented a presentation at a scholarly professional meeting.

**Target for O11: Leadership Recognition**

35% of the students will submit abstracts, either singularly or co-authored with faculty, for scholarly presentations at professional meetings.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the doctoral students who responded to a survey about accomplishments, 10 (100%) indicated they had presented a presentation at a scholarly professional meeting.

**M 11: Publication in Refereed Journals (O: 9, 11)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six (50%) of the alumni responding to the 1-, 3-, and 5-year surveys reported publications in refereed journals.

**Target for O11: Leadership Recognition**

20% of the graduates will publish articles in refereed journals by 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Six (50%) of the alumni responding to the 1-, 3-, and 5-year surveys reported publications in refereed journals.

**M 12: Funded Research (O: 10, 11)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the six alumni responding to the surveys, two (33.3%) reported that they had funded research.

**Target for O11: Leadership Recognition**

5% of the graduates will receive funding to support research projects within 5 years post-graduation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the six alumni responding to the surveys, two (33.3%) reported that they had funded research.

**M 13: Presentation at Professional Meetings (O: 7, 11)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the six doctoral students responding to the survey, all (100%) had made presentations (N=89) at professional meetings; they reported an average of 14.8 professional presentations.

**Target for O11: Leadership Recognition**

50% of the graduates will give presentations at local, regional, national and/or international meetings and/or conferences

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Of the six doctoral students responding to the survey, all (100%) had made presentations (N=89) at professional meetings; they reported an average of 14.8 professional presentations.

**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
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: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Funded Research | Outcome/Objective: Funded Research
Implementation Description: July 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Cece Grindel

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

Records of Article Submission
Students often fail to complete the annual Student Accomplishments Survey. Thus an accurate summary of their accomplishments is not well documented. A better tracking process is needed.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Professional Presentations | Outcome/Objective: Presentations at Professionals Meetings
Measure: Submission of manuscripts for publication | Outcome/Objective: Submission of Manuscripts
Measure: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding | Outcome/Objective: Funded Research
Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director for Graduate Programs; doctoral faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The analysis indicated that our students and alumni are meeting our expectations regarding progression through the program and scholarly productivity during their program of study and in the first 5 years post graduation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
To accurately track student accomplishments, a better tracking method needs to be implemented.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
The doctoral program is reaching new heights in enrollment. The STEPS program is successful and we currently have about 10 students who are in the USG attending. We are now beginning to see the impact of increased enrollment which is resulting in an increased faculty workload. We are reaching the maximum number of enrolled students due to research faculty resources. We are pleased with the outcomes of our students and alumni.

Contributions to the Institution
The contributions to the institution: 1. A respected doctoral program that prepares nurse researchers and faculty 2. Contributes to the achievement of the GSU strategic plan
**Highlights**
1. Increase in student publication submissions, regional and national presentations, and applications for dissertation funding. 2. One student was selected as a Hartford Doctoral Fellow.

**Challenges**
1. Lack of sufficient research faculty to support doctoral education

**Research and Scholarly Activities**
1. Increase in student publication submissions, regional and national presentations, and applications for dissertation funding. 2. One student was selected as a Hartford Doctoral Fellow.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Nutrition BS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST)

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**
The Division of Nutrition at Georgia State University is to prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics. Admission to this Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE)-accredited program is at the junior year. The program graduates approximately 30 students each year.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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**
5 Contemporary Issues

**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**
5 Contemporary Issues

**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**
4 Critical Thinking
7 Technology

**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**
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

**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  
2. Oral Communication

---

### 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

4. Critical Thinking  
6. Quantitative Skills

---

### 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

3. Collaboration

### 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.

---

### 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** 2007-2008 - 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** 2007-2008 - 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** 2007-2008 - 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** 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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**

70% overall

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

**Target for O2: Integrate social sciences**

70% overall

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

**Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**

70% overall

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

**Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding**

70% overall

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).
Target for O5: Communicate effectively
70% overall

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients
70% overall

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles
70% overall

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs
70% overall

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score was 64.6% on the total examination. The mean scores on the exit exam were generally low for all areas (Objective 1 -- 64%; Objective 2 -- 61%; Objective 3 -- 64%; Objective 4 -- 61%; Objective 5 -- 52%; Objective 6 -- 59%; Objective 7 -- 58%; Objective 8 -- 66%).

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for O2: Integrate social sciences
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for O3: Utilize critical thinking skills
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding
4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory" (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).
Target for **O5: Communicate effectively**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory” (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for **O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory” (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for **O7: Apply knowledge of management principles**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory” (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

Target for **O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Exiting students generally rated their preparation for all outcomes outstanding” or "more than satisfactory” (Objective 1 – 18/19; Objective 2 – 18/19; Objective 3 – 18/18; Objective 4 – 19/19; Objective 5 – 19/19; Objective 6 – 17/19; Objective 7 – 18/19; Objective 8 – 16/19).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU: 3.8/2/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

Target for **O2: Integrate social sciences**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU: 3.8/2/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

Target for **O3: Utilize critical thinking skills**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU: 3.8/2/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile
percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

**Target for O4: Demonstrate science understanding**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

**Target for O5: Communicate effectively**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

**Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

**Target for O7: Apply knowledge of management principles**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile

**Target for O8: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs**

4/5 (Good or more than satisfactory)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The alumni survey was not completed this year. The APR survey was administered instead. The APR survey included the years that would have been covered by the division survey. These results show the following: Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of undergraduate majors. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.0/5.0; rank 67 percentile The undergraduate program of study was academically challenging. Nutrition: 4.38/5.0, GSU 3.99/5.0; rank 88 percentile Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. Nutrition: 4.25/5.0, GSU 4.18/5.0; rank 47 percentile I feel the undergraduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Nutrition: 4.06/5.0, GSU 3.69/4.0; rank 77 percentile There was open communication between faculty and undergraduate students about student concerns. Nutrition: 3.9/5.0, GSU 3.82/5.0; rank 50 percentile Class size was suitable for effective learning. Nutrition: 4.59/5.0, GSU 4.08/5.0; rank 85 percentile
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve alumni evaluation return rate**
We plan to improve our alumni database and our evaluation methods to increase our alumni return rate.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Alumni survey  
  - Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles  
  - Communicate effectively  
  - Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle  
  - Demonstrate science understanding  
  - Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients  
  - Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs  
  - Integrate social sciences  
  - Utilize critical thinking skills

*Implementation Description:* April 15, 2007  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Mildred Cody  
*Additional Resources:* Clerical help in the division and assistance from the Alumni Association

**Strengthening Learning Outcome #7**
Faculty will discuss methods of strengthening Learning Outcome #7 (Apply knowledge of management principles and systems...). The undergraduate program director will develop the implementation plan for faculty approval.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive senior examination  
  - Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles
- Measure: Exit questionnaire  
  - Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles

*Implementation Description:* April 1, 2007  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Dea Baxter, director of the undergraduate program

**Strengthening Learning Outcome #8**
Faculty will discuss methods of strengthening Learning Outcome #8 (Describe the impact of laws, regulations, and costs on health care systems and food and nutrition programs). The undergraduate program director will develop the implementation plan for faculty approval.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive senior examination  
  - Outcome/Objective: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs
- Measure: Exit questionnaire  
  - Outcome/Objective: Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs

*Implementation Description:* April 1, 2007  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Dea Baxter, undergraduate program director

**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  
  - Communicate effectively  
  - Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle  
  - Demonstrate science understanding  
  - Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients  
  - Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs  
  - Integrate social sciences  
  - Utilize critical thinking skills

*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  
  - Communicate effectively  
  - Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle  
  - Demonstrate science understanding  
  - Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients  
  - Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs  
  - Integrate social sciences  
  - Utilize critical thinking skills

*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

Review use of portfolio
Our undergraduates have spent significant time on portfolio development over the past several years because it was required by our accrediting agency. It is no longer required. Our new DPD Director will review continuing this measure during the coming year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge of management principles
  | Communicate effectively | Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle | Demonstrate science understanding | Demonstrate understanding of roles of nutrients | Describe the impact of laws, regulations, costs | Integrate social sciences | Utilize critical thinking skills

Implementation Description: April 2009
Responsible Person/Group: DPD Director (Barbara Hopkins)

Strengthen Learning Outcome #7
We have hired a new part-time instructor to teach undergraduates in a separate course from graduate students. This course meets twice a week instead of once a week. We anticipate 3-4 faculty retirement over the next 2-3 years and will focus on hiring a faculty member with this expertise during this time.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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: August 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Lynda Goodfellow (School Director)
Additional Resources: Line position, salary

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Student reflections show strong achievement (confidence) in all 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, health regulation, and application of management principles. These student perceptions were not supported by scores on the comprehensive examination, which are below the target values but higher than last year.

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 set a target at 75%. Scores on the comprehensive exit exam were somewhat higher in all areas this year, but they are not at the target. 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 focus on the management area as we refill lines vacated by retiring faculty.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Operations Management MS
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources and activities that produce and deliver the goods and services for customers. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company’s competitive position by providing superior products and services.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Operations 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**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Operations Planning and Control (M: 3)**
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 operations 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**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.00; sub item c, 2.33. Qualitative comments from instructors showed that all areas were adequate across courses, however room for improvement remained. Lack of experience is suggested as a cause for the lack of desired depth in many projects.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.00; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.67. Instructors suggested that students had these capabilities in general. Integration, however, takes a bit more effort than some groups were willing to put into their projects; this is seen as an area in which students cut corners when time is pressing to complete their work.

**M 3: Performance (O: 1, 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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.00. Instructors were generally favorable to performance in this area in their qualitative comments but also suggested that students often times were not as strong in application of quantitative analysis as they were in qualitative analysis.

**Target for O3: Operations Planning and Control**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Student quantitative scores were the following on this year’s group projects: Sub item a, 2.33; sub item b, 2.33; sub item c, 2.00. Instructors were generally favorable to performance in this area in their qualitative comments but also suggested that students often times were not as strong in application of quantitative analysis as they were in qualitative analysis.

**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.

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

**Peer Evaluations**

Student peer evaluation may be needed to identify uneven contribution and delivery.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Team Skills
  - Outcome/Objective: Employment
- **Implementation Description:** AY 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Qualitative Emphasis**

Some quantitative analytical methods are covered in the later part of the course, which may be the reason students use qualitative methods.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Reasoned Analysis
  - Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- **Implementation Description:** AY 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OM Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Supply Chain Emphasis**

Their weaknesses come from a lack of experience in the analysis of a production process. The course will need to place more emphasis on the production process when developing the overall supply chain strategy.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: AY 2007
Responsible Person/Group: OM Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None

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

Change in Assessment Procedure
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: Low

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: 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

Attention to the Details
More emphasis will be place on the analysis of smaller details within the projects as well as on the overall picture of the process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Operations Planning and Control
- Operations Strategy
- Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

Changing Some Assessment Venues
• Change the assessment of the electives to include only MGS 8770 and MGS 8710 and MGS 8740. MGS 8760 does not consistently have a major project.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Operations Planning and Control
- Measure: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

Emphasis of Distinctions between MBA & MS students

• Next year’s assessment will include the tracking of the differences between MBA students with a concentration in operations management and MS students with a major in operations management. Redesigned and refocused questionnaires will be implemented for both types of students.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Performance | Outcome/Objective: Operations Planning and Control
- Measure: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Team Skills | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

OM Integration Emphasis

• Continue and increase the focus on the relationships between OM and the other functions within the organization, this includes the highlighting of OM and its overall importance.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy
- Measure: Reasoned Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Operations Strategy

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Craig Hill

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

• Reasoned analysis: The students continue to show general strength in their ability to develop the structure of an organization from a macro point of view. They have also shown some improved ability to relate this information to a more diverse set of issues. The development of a high level of analysis was a strong point on these students work, included both depth and breadth of analysis. • Integrated recommendations: The feedback from the student teams showed a strong ability to develop integrated solutions. • Indentify critical success factors: The students had gained many insights into the importance of the analytical tools in making proposals that will make the company and its supply chain more competitive. The students continue to perform well on the analytical portion of their project work. • Student contribution on project: Their insight into the overall industry was apparent in the projects that the teams worked on; this is related to students who have job experience that required them to work within an organization. Their project work indicated they were able to relate their work experiences into the classroom setting.

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

• Emphasis needs to be increased on gaining the details in the analysis of a process or supply chain. Including the input of the instructor early on in the class. • A more in-depth and consistent analysis seems to be called for in the student projects.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Organizational Change MS
As of 12/12/2016 03:13 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**

- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**

- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**

- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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. 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. 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.

#### 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 demonstrate that he/she engaged a client in a discussion related to 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 promoted 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. Rating Scale: Yes or No

**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)**

**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

---

**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)**

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 4: Development & demonstration of professional skills (M: 1, 5, 8, 9)**

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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 5: Knowledge of professional standards and ethics (M: 1, 8)**

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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

SLO 6: Formulate/communicate quantifiable financial goal (M: 1, 8)

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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

SLO 7: Develop and maintain an integrated financial plan (M: 8)

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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

SLO 8: Explanation of technical concepts to clients (M: 8)

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

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Value to graduates (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10)

MS-PFP graduates value the program.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 2: Awareness/participation in professional societies (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

MS-PFP graduates will be aware of relevant professional designations and be encouraged to obtain them and to participate in professional societies.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent (100%) of enrolled students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan that 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent (100%) of enrolled students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan that 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent (100%) of enrolled students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan that 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Assessment 1: One hundred percent (100%) of enrolled students in PFP 8400 wrote an integrated plan that 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 (100%) of enrolled 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses (Mean = 4.03 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale). Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.88 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses (Mean = 4.03 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale). Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.88 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses (Mean = 4.03 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale). Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.88 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied with the overall PFP career preparation provided by the MS-PFP program (Mean = 4.22 on a 5-point scale) and with the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (Mean = 4.11 on a 5-point scale). Both numbers are an improvement over last year's findings.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied with the overall PFP career preparation provided by the MS-PFP program (Mean = 4.22 on a 5-point scale) and with the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (Mean = 4.11 on a 5-point scale). Both numbers are an improvement over last year's findings.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni are highly satisfied with the overall PFP career preparation provided by the MS-PFP program (Mean = 4.22 on a 5-point scale) and with the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (Mean = 4.11 on a 5-point scale). Both numbers are an improvement over last year's findings.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Value to graduates</th>
<th>Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Alumni are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 4.06 on a 5-point scale). Every attribute was rated above average at 3.44 (“coverage of international topics”) or higher. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies</th>
<th>Alumni will report satisfaction (score of 3.0 or greater on a 5-point scale) with various program attributes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Alumni are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 4.06 on a 5-point scale). Every attribute was rated above average at 3.44 (“coverage of international topics”) or higher. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Graduating Student Survey - PFP Competency (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Value to graduates</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.45 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses. Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.82 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.45 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses. Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.82 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.45 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses. Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.82 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Development &amp; demonstration of professional skills</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Graduating students are highly satisfied (Mean = 4.45 for RMI Department courses, on a 5-point scale) in the level of personal financial planning competency obtained across various departmental courses. Their reported level of satisfaction drops when all courses, departmental and non-departmental, are considered (Mean = 3.82 for all courses), but the overall score is still almost one point above average. &gt;&gt;SURVEY RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Graduating Student Survey - Career Preparation (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Value to graduates</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Graduating students are highly satisfied with the overall PFP career preparation provided by the MS-PFP program (Mean =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each student participates in a role-play exercise once as a planner and once as a client. Qualitative feedback from students suggests that this is a very challenging exercise. 2. Each student prepares a "Greenfield" financial plan—acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. 3. Each student takes a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. 4. Each student prepares a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five "live interview" sources are required. 5. Each student is part of the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize the value of participating in professional societies, such as the Financial Planning Association.

Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students are highly satisfied with the overall PFP career preparation provided by the MS-PFP program (Mean = 4.73 on a 5-point scale) and with the extent to which the program has enhanced their career opportunities (Mean = 4.60 on a 5-point scale). Both numbers are an improvement over last year’s findings.

Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 3.88 on a 5-point scale). Although every attribute was rated above average, "enhancement of computer skills" and "coverage of international topics" were the lowest at 3.18 and 3.27, respectively. >>SURVEY RESULTS

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 3.88 on a 5-point scale). Although every attribute was rated above average, "enhancement of computer skills" and "coverage of international topics" were the lowest at 3.18 and 3.27, respectively. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 3.88 on a 5-point scale). Although every attribute was rated above average, "enhancement of computer skills" and "coverage of international topics" were the lowest at 3.18 and 3.27, respectively. >>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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Graduating students are highly satisfied across the various program attributes assessed (Mean = 3.88 on a 5-point scale). Although every attribute was rated above average, "enhancement of computer skills" and "coverage of international topics" were the lowest at 3.18 and 3.27, respectively. >>SURVEY RESULTS

M 8: 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 once as a planner and once as a client. Qualitative feedback from students suggests that this is a very challenging exercise. 2. Each student prepares a "Greenfield" financial plan—acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class. 3. Each student takes a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes. Average scores on the exam are roughly 60 percent, similar to the actual exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the coursework in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself. 4. Each student prepares a research paper on an assigned financial planning practice topic. Five written and five "live interview" sources are required. 5. Each student is part of the PFP 8520 speaker series. The speakers are prominent practitioners who emphasize the value of participating in professional societies, such as the Financial Planning Association.

Target for O2: Awareness/participation in professional societies

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of the students took a mock CFP examination as well as several exam style quizzes.
The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Target for O3: Use of professional/technical resources**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 O5: Knowledge of professional standards and ethics**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 O6: Formulate/communicate quantifiable financial goal**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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.
One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 O7: Develop and maintain an integrated financial plan**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 O8: Explanation of technical concepts to clients**

The program director will report satisfaction with student performance in meeting the stated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 (100%) 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 national average for 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 (100%) of students enrolled in the course 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 9: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Relying on the best information available from the CFP® Board, the PFP Program Director determined that 14 Georgia State University students took the CFP® Exam during this academic year, a substantial increase from last year’s six. Ten passed the exam. This 70% pass rate is higher than the national pass rate for first-time takers of 60%.
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. The panel met on February 23, 2007, and their report was included in the 2006-2007 assessment report. The panel will meet again in 2010.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The panel met on February 23, 2007, and their report was included in the 2006-2007 assessment report. For the record, a summary of their recommendations appear below. The panel will meet again in 2010. 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. 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. The panel met on February 23, 2007, and their report was included in the 2006-2007 assessment report. The panel will meet again in 2010.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The panel met on February 23, 2007, and their report was included in the 2006-2007 assessment report. For the record, a summary of their recommendations appear below. The panel will meet again in 2010. 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. 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.

- **Established in Cycle: 2005-2006**
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ciccotello/Elger/PFP Advisory Group
- **Additional Resources:** To be determined

**Revised investment course options**

Continue development and implementation of a PFP-specific investment planning course

- **Established in Cycle: 2005-2006**
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Graduating Student Survey - PFP Competency
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Value to graduates
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ciccotello/Elger

**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 as
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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008

### 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Measurement (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triennial PFP Program Review Panel</td>
<td>Program is relevant to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

### 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

### Additional emphasis on placement/alumni activities

Qualitative comments from our alumni survey revealed that they would like to see the following changes made to the program:(1) additional emphasis on job placement and(2) additional activities for alumni(more alumni outreach). The PFP Director will improve communications between the PFP Alumni Club and current students. The club also serves as an excellent link to job placement opportunities. Additionally, the department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. Her duties include:(1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students;(2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department;(3) work closely with the Office of Graduate Admissions to manage the graduate application process; and(4) provide dedicated staff support for the department’s scholarship award process.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Measurement (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Career Preparation</td>
<td>Awareness/participation in professional societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program is relevant to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - PFP Competency</td>
<td>Awareness/participation in professional societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program is relevant to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Attributes</td>
<td>Awareness/participation in professional societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation Description:** September 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

### Expand coverage of international topics

The PFP Program Director will integrate considerations in planning for international clients such as jointly-located executives.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Measurement (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Attributes</td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Survey - Program Attributes</td>
<td>Value to graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Course (PFP 8400)</td>
<td>Development &amp; demonstration of professional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulate/communicate quantifiable financial goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFP 8520 Capstone Course</td>
<td>Develop and maintain an integrated financial plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development &amp; demonstration of professional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of technical concepts to clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulate/communicate quantifiable financial goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation Description:** Fall 2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

### Further implementation of Review Panel suggestions

The suggestions made by the 2007 Review Panel, as summarized below, were considered and each area is being given added...
emphasize in capstone course (PFP 8520) discussions and case analyses. Further curriculum revisions based on the Panel’s recommendation are being considered by the faculty. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Measure: Triennial PFP Program Review Panel</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Program is relevant to employers</th>
<th>Value to graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implementation Description: Fall 2009
| Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello |

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Overall, the MS-PFP program is attracting a good mix of qualified young and more experienced students, who are generally pleased with the program’s course offerings and services. Strong progress has been made on revising RMI 8220 to 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. The revised course could be offered as early as Fall 2009. The capstone course PFP 8520 was revised based on recommendations made by the 2007 Review Panel. Each area of need is being given added emphasis in course discussions and case analyses. Further revisions based on the Panel’s recommendations are being considered by the faculty across the PFP curriculum. The PFP Student/Alumni Club has been very active, and continues to invite financial planning students from other CFP Board registered programs to its quarterly meetings. Efforts to bring together job seekers with PFP firms are continuously improving. Job opportunities continue to be communicated via the PFP Student Alumni network electronically. Additional efforts to meet with employers have resulted in numerous placement opportunities for students. The department has added an Administrative Specialist – Student Services that will hopefully continue to add value to the student and alumni experience.

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

Although some progress was made during the 2007-2008 academic year on the development and implementation of a PFP-specific investment planning course, the lack of faculty resources has meant that the PFP Program has not progressed sufficiently in the development of a much-needed investment planning course. Discussions are ongoing with Professor Craig Ruff of the Finance Department, as there is a mutual interest in offering such a course. The current coursework in this area is offered by Finance and does not have a strong planning orientation. The ultimate goal is to offer a course 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. Given the current PFP staffing constraints, implementation remains a difficult challenge. Adequate coverage of international topics continues to be an area of concern. The PFP Program Director will integrate considerations in planning for international clients such as jointly-located executives.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2007-2008 Philosophy Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:13 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 systemically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU’s strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University’s curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives (M: 1, 2, 3)**
All philosophy students should possess philosophical skills. More particularly, students successfully completing Phil 1010 should be able to analyze information and arguments by: distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying the premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own well-written argumentative essays.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.1 Recruitment
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: PHIL 2010 Learning Objective 1: Content (M: 2, 3, 4)**
All philosophy students should have mastery of content knowledge. More particularly, students in Great Questions of Philosophy (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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.1 Recruitment
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Writing ability (O: 1)**
This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) adequately possess writing skills. Measurement is done for 1010 by selecting five 1010 classes at random and taking the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and having 3 Assessment Committee members score those 20 papers (on a 4 point scale) for writing ability.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in writing ability.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As this measure relates to Phil 1010 Learning, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding writing, the average score for the papers was 2.78.

**M 2: Philosophical skills (O: 1, 2)**
This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions in Philosophy (Phil 2010) adequately possess philosophical skills. Measurement is done for 1010 by selecting five 1010 classes at random and taking the final papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and having 3 Assessment Committee members score those 20 papers (on a 4 point scale) for philosophical skills. Measurement is done for 2010 by selecting five 2010 classes at random and taking the final exams submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and having the instructors give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating philosophical skills.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives**
Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in philosophical skills.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
This measure concerns both of our Outcomes for the Core. As it pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored (on a 4 point scale) by the 3 Assessment Committee members. Regarding philosophical skills, the average score for the papers was 2.56. As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we also selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating philosophical skills. The average score the instructors gave the tests for philosophical skills was 2.65.
M 3: Application (O: 1, 2)
Philosophy students should be able to apply philosophical abilities and skills to contemporary problems. This measure is meant to determine if students in Critical Thinking (Phil 1010) and Great Questions of Philosophy (Phil 2010) can do so at an adequate level. Measurement is done for 1010 by selecting five 1010 classes at random and taking the final papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and having 3 Assessment Committee members score those 20 papers (on a 4 point scale) for application skills. Measurement is done for 2010 by selecting five 2010 classes at random and taking the final exams submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and having the instructors give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating application skills.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives

Papers of 1010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in application skills.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As this measure pertains to the Phil 1010 Learning Goals, we selected five 1010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes. The 20 papers were then scored by the 3 Assessment Committee members who gave them an average score of 2.62 (on a 4 point scale) 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 papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating the ability to apply what they learned. The average score the instructors gave the tests for that ability was a 2.77.

M 4: Content Knowledge (O: 2)

This measure is meant to determine if students in 2010 have the appropriate level of content knowledge. To measure this, we select five 2010 classes at random and take the final exams submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and require those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O2: PHIL 2010 Learning Objective 1: Content

Final exams of 2010 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.5 in content knowledge.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
As this measure pertains to the Phil 2010 Learning Goals, we selected five 2010 classes at random and then took the papers submitted by the first four students listed on the GoSolar roll of each of those classes and required those instructors to give each of the exams a score (on a 4 point scale) isolating content knowledge. The average score the instructors gave the tests for this was a 2.92.

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

Improve Assessment Committee
Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Application | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives
- Measure: Philosophical skills | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives
- Measure: Writing ability | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 cycle
Projected Completion Date: 07/2008
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew Jason Cohen

Redesign of Phil 1010
Two years ago, 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 retention to graduation efforts.) We have already begun to institute this change, but it will be complete in the Fall of 2009. The course now has 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 is 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 now largely completed a new critical thinking text that is being used in an almost final form in all sections of 1010. As our course redesign will be further implemented in Fall 08 and fully implemented in Fall 09, it is likely that we will be begin an in-depth review of the redesign. This may well include revision to the learning outcomes and assessment measures.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Application | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives
- Measure: Philosophical skills | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives
- Measure: Writing ability | Outcome/Objective: PHIL 1010 Learning Objectives

Implementation Description: ongoing
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Philosophy BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU's strategic plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University's curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: “Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students. . . .” The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students majoring in philosophy are expected to gain: general knowledge of a variety of philosophical systems and movements from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy (ancient/medieval and modern) and detailed knowledge of at least one system or movement in each of these two periods; general knowledge of the thought of various major philosophers from the different periods in the history of Western philosophy and detailed knowledge of at least one philosopher from each of the two periods; a familiarity with representative philosophers and movements in contemporary philosophy and in-depth understanding of at least one philosopher in at least two of the movements; knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in at least three of the main areas of philosophy (ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, epistemology, and logic, all defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy); knowledge of the distinctive contributions made by philosophy to intellectual inquiry; and knowledge of the relevance of philosophy to contemporary American culture and life.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations
6.1 Recruitment

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 and Phil 2010. 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.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
As can be seen in the “Action Plan,” the Department has been instituting a major change to the way we deliver Phil 1010. 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.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2007
Responsible Person/Group: George Rainbolt and Sandra Dwyer
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Philosophical skills (O: 1)**

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: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content**

4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in philosophical skills.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Senior majors in all 4000 level philosophy classes submitted their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average score of 2.91 (on a 4 point scale) for philosophical skills.

**M 2: Communication (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 both. It is a determination of whether our majors are able to communicate using appropriate oral and signed conventions and formats. To measure communication skills, we require the instructors of the 20 papers used for other parts of this assessment to give each of the students a score isolating their communication skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content**

Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in communication skills.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a score isolating their communication skills. The average score (on a 4 point scale) the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.18.

**M 3: Collaboration (O: 1)**

We expect our majors to participate effectively in the collaborative activities of our discipline. These primarily include engaging in philosophical discourse, both orally and in written work. This measure is meant to determine if they do so. To measure collaborative ability, we require the instructors of the 20 papers used for other parts of this assessment to give each of the students a score isolating their collaborative abilities.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content**

Philosophy Majors should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in collaboration skills.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically for evaluation. We also required the instructors to give each of the students a score isolating their collaborative abilities. The average score (on a 4 point scale) the instructors gave the students for this was a 3.16.

**M 4: Content Knowledge (O: 1)**

All philosophy students should have mastery of content knowledge. More particularly, our majors should have well detailed content knowledge as outlined in the Philosophy BA Learning Goal. 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 content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content**

4000 level papers should, on average, be evaluated as 2.75 in content knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Senior Majors in any 4000 level philosophy class were required to submit their final papers electronically. These were evaluated by the 3 Assessment Committee Members who gave them an average score of 3.04 (on a 4 point scale) for this measure.

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

**Phil 2010**

After discussion, the faculty decided no curricular changes were warranted at this time for Phil 2010. Nor does the Department see any real flaws in the current assessment procedure. However, the data was reported in too many different formats. This made data collection and aggregation inefficient. The Assessment Coordinator developed a form to standardize the reporting of the data. This
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).

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.

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 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 is being tested in draft form this (Spring 2007) semester and will be used for all sections starting in Fall 2007.

Improve Assessment Committee

Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

Streamline Assessment of BA

Current Policy has the Committee evaluating all papers submitted by Philosophy Majors to 4000 level classes. When majors are few, this seems appropriate. This year, though, the Committee evaluated 40 such papers. This seems more extensive than is needed. (We only evaluate 20 papers from 1010 or 2010.) Hence, upon the Coordinator’s recommendation, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to change the procedure in the following way: we continue to collect all of the papers as we do now, but when there are more than 20, the Coordinator chooses 20 of them for assessment, using a random number generator to do so.
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 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. We do, however, wish to improve the scores our majors receive for philosophical skills.

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

Our majors’ average on content exceeded their 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 (as per our action plan).

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Philosophy MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information. Both ethics and critical reasoning are stressed in GSU's strategic plan, which states: "In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University's curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices." Likewise, the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences states: "Central goals in Humanities include enhancing the communication and critical thinking abilities of all Georgia State students . . . ." The Philosophy Department serves the citizens of Georgia in several complementary ways. In addition to its highly ranked M.A. program, it plays a significant role in undergraduate education.

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.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
For each MA thesis defended in the department, all committee members were required to report a score regarding philosophical skills. The average of these scores was 3.57 (on a 4 point scale).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
For each MA thesis defended in the department, all committee members were required to report a score regarding content knowledge. The average of these scores was 3.82 (on a 4 point scale).

**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

**Improve Assessment Committee**
Upon the recommendation of the Coordinator, at its March 14 meeting, the Department decided to expand the Assessment Committee by one (bringing the Committee to 4, including the Coordinator). This will allow for improved evaluation of the papers that are collected and used in the overall assessment process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: MA Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content
- Measure: MA Philosophical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content

**Implementation Description:** 2008-2009 cycle
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Andrew Jason Cohen

**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: 104 graduate students were enrolled in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program in Fall of 2007. Nineteen are scheduled to graduate in August of 2008.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

| SLO 1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | 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. |
| SLO 2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates demonstrate compassion, caring, and empathy in providing serves to patients/clients. |
| SLO 3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, and other health care providers, students, other consumers and payers. |
| SLO 4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates demonstrate professional behaviors in all interactions with patients/clients |
| SLO 5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | 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. |
| SLO 6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | 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. |
| SLO 7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates identify, respect, and act with consideration for patients’/clients’ differences, values, preferences, and expressed needs in all professional activities. |
| SLO 8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates demonstrate a systematic process for clinical judgement and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning. |
| SLO 9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | 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. |
| SLO 10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) | Graduates effectively educate others using culturally appropriate teaching methods that are commensurate with the needs of the learner. |
SLO 11: Patient/Client Management Expectation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Graduates demonstrate competency in the five elements of care including examination, evaluation, diagnosis, prognosis, and intervention for patients across the lifespan.

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.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class
mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
72% of first-year DPT students scored 70% or higher on the 50-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. The Class mean was 71%. 73% of second-year DPT students scored 75% or higher on the 100-question cumulative and comprehensive exam. Third year DPT students will take the comprehensive examination in July, prior to their August graduation. Those data will be entered at that time.

**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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

**Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

**Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

**Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.
### Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty. Posters of the 8 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia in Savannah, Georgia on April 19, 2008. These posters were externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. Manuscript preparation for publication has been achieved in 4 of the 8 groups.

### M 4: Clinical competence (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)


### Target for O1: Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students graduating in August 2008 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
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

Clinical instructors will assess students’ clinical competence at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above the 50th percentile, 75th percentile, and 100th percentile, respectively.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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 3% 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 2008.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. 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 2008.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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, 6% at 95% and 3% at 90%. 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 2008.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students graduating in August 2008 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 2008.
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, 6% at 95% and 6% at 90%. 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 95% or higher. 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, 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 2008.

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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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
target to be developed

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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 O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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 O12: Practice Management Expectation**
target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
A comprehensive list of employers of the 2007 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.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O2: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O3: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O4: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectation: Communication
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O6: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O7: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.

Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice
85% first-time pass rate 100% ultimate pass-rate.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.
Target for **O10**: Prof Practice Expectation: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O11**: Patient/Client Management Expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O12**: Practice Management Expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data are not available for the Class of 2008, graduating in August. Results from the Class of 2007 show a 95% first time pass rate. 36 of 38 graduates passed the National Physical Therapy Examination on their first attempt. Of the two who retook the exam, both passed on their first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

target to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O2**: Prof Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring

target to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O3**: Prof Practice Expectation: Integrity

target to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O4**: Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty

target to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O5**: Prof Practice Expectations: Communication

target to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for **O6**: Prof Practice Expectation: Altruism
Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

**Target for 07: Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Target for 08: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Target for 09: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Target for 010: Prof Practice Expectation: Education**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Target for 011: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**Target for 012: Practice Management Expectation**

target to be developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Graduates from the Class of 2007 agreed or highly agreed that their academic instruction prepared them to practice. Specific areas needing improvement included clinical education, and increased clinical application in courses such as anatomy, cardiopulmonary, and biomechanics.

**M 8: Professional Behaviors (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

The Clinical Performance Instrument for the Physical Therapist Student, (questions 1-5) developed by the American Physical Therapy Association.

**Target for 01: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### Target for O5: Prof Practice Expectation: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### Target for O8: Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

### Target for O9: Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

Target for O10: Prof Practice Expectation: Education
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectation
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students completing their final clinical rotation prior to graduating in August 2008, (n=19) 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, 2008.

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

Improve Scores on Division Comprehensive Exams
Under the guidance of the Division’s Student Promotion and Retention Committee, the faculty will review the comprehensive examinations currently given the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year DPT students in order to see if the questions are reflective of current practice standards. Responses to examination questions will be reviewed. Trends, regarding types of questions missed, will be assessed (e.g. Neuro, Ortho, Clinical Reasoning) with a corresponding curricular assessment of topic areas. In 2006, the third year students who fell short of the 80% pass rate goal were responsible for correcting all their missed questions on the final comprehensive exam. Each student provided Dr. Deborah Michael, Chair of the Student Promotion and Retention Committee, with a summary statement for each question missed, including documentation of corresponding evidence as to why their first choice was incorrect and why their new choice was correct. Based on students’ feedback as to the benefits of this reflexive self-assessment exercise, we will incorporate this into the examination experience for all three years of students, thus enhancing learning opportunities.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| 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 conference or regional conference and/or to a peer-reviewed journal. 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 national conference or regional conference and/or to a peer-reviewed journal.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Capstone research project | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation |
| Practice Management Expectation | Prof Practice Expectation: Accountability |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning |
| Prof Practice Expectation: 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
Continue 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: 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:** 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 reflective 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: 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
Further refining of comprehensive exam process
The comprehensive examinations were implemented in 2006, and appear to be a useful tool in assessing overall mastery of information learned to date as well as a useful preparatory tool for taking the licensure examination. Last year, only the graduating students engaged in the remediation process. This year, students who fell below the established standard(70% for first year DPT students and 75% for second year DPT students) engaged in the remediation process which included a summative statement for each question missed with documentation of corresponding evidence of why their first choice was incorrect, and evidence supporting their new choice. We will investigate the effectiveness of this comprehensive self-reflexive process through focus groups with the students.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: Professional Duty |

Implementation Description: June 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Student Promotion and Retention & Curriculum Committees

Initiate new grading system 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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Speltmeber, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: ACCE and Division Head
Additional Resources: Purchase on-line CPI Web-based assessment tool for Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education and Clinical Instructors to use.

Physical therapist instructors in all classes
All classes will include an instructors who is a licensed and experienced physical therapist.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Clinical competence | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation |
| Practice Management Expectation | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Education |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty |
| Measure: Comprehensive Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation |
| Practice Management Expectation | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Education |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty |
| Measure: Evidence-based case study | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation |
| Practice Management Expectation | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Education |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice |
| Measure: Professional Behaviors | Outcome/Objective: Patient/Client Management Expectation |
| Practice Management Expectation | Prof Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Cultural Competence |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Education |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Evidence-Based Practice |
| Prof Practice Expectation: Professional Duty |

Implementation Description: August 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum committee, ACCE, Division Head
Additional Resources: Additional clinical faculty to assist or lead in targeted courses.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Improvements in two specific areas are evident as we compare this year’s data with data from last year. There was a significant increase in the comprehensive examination scores for the first and second year DPT students, which we attribute, in part, to the curricular revisions initiated over the past several years. Another area of improvement was the increase in overall first time pass rate on the national licensure examination.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We will need to identify and implement a more effective method of capturing employee responses about our students' clinical preparedness.
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: Critical Thinking in Area D courses (M: 1, 2)
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
4 Critical Thinking

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture (O: 1)
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 O1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed physics courses. Based on data from 431 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 4.8 out of 10 and 57% of students scored 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 372 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.6 out of 10 and 65% of students scored 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 147 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.3 out of 10 and 56% of students scored 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 43 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 7.0 out of 10 and 83% of students scored 5.0 or higher.

M 2: Astronomy Intro Sequence (O: 1)
A set of core questions is included on final exams in every section. These questions stressed physical, spatial, and quantitative reasoning.

Target for O1: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from 548 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 48%. Based on data from 252 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 59%.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Department Assessment Committee Review
The Departmental Assessment Committee will meet and review the results from the previous three 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. In addition, the department assessment committee with interact with the new IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group so that critical thinking remains a significant factor in the consideration of curricular or pedagogical changes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Astronomy Intro Sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
- **Measure:** Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
**Implementation Description:** September 30, 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms/Department Assessment Committee

### IMPACT group

The department has formed the IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group to work on improving teaching of introductory physics and astronomy. The department assessment committee has regular contact with IMPACT group (some people serve on both committees) to assure that the critical thinking learning outcome is one of the factors considered in these efforts. Over the spring 2008 term the group worked to establish a new framework for core and optional content in Phys1111 and Phys1112 and also to spell out the most important skills (including critical thinking). This group will continue to evaluate issues involved in successful teaching and learning in the introductory physics and astronomy courses over the 2008/2009 academic year. Of particular interest to the group will be the implementation of a studio model (integrated lecture and lab) using a classroom now under renovation for that purpose.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Astronomy Intro Sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
- **Measure:** Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
**Implementation Description:** already ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Cherilynn Morrow

### New Faculty Members

The department has taken several actions to improve teaching and learning of physics and astronomy at the introductory level. Two of those actions involve new faculty. The department has hired (effective Fall 2008) a second lecturer which will result in far fewer courses being taught by adjunct or visiting faculty. This will improve the continuity and consistency of the instruction as well as the general level of expertise and experience in the introductory physics courses. The main impact will be for Phys1111 and Phys1112. The new lecturer is highly knowledgeable and experienced in physics education research (PER) proven techniques and will also be participating in the nascent physics and astronomy education research program in the department. In addition, a faculty member (Dr. Cherilynn Morrow) has been hired at the level of professor with an expertise and research area in physics education. She joined the faculty for the Spring 2008 term. She leads the new physics education research group and will contribute to curricular and pedagogical changes made by the new IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Astronomy Intro Sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
- **Measure:** Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
**Implementation Description:** completed  
**Responsible Person/Group:** H. Richard Miller, Department Chairman

### New Textbook for Phys1111 and Phys1112

The department has adopted a new textbook for Phys1111 and Phys1112. The new textbook is by the same author as the textbook currently used in Phys2211 and Phys2212. This textbook incorporates proven pedagogy and we expect to see improvements in critical thinking in the 1000-level physics course. The new textbook will be used in Phys1111 for Fall 2008 and in Phys1111 and Phys1112 starting in Spring 2009.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Astronomy Intro Sequence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
- **Measure:** Physics Intro Sequences - Lecture  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking in Area D courses  
**Implementation Description:** adoption completed in January of 2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms/Phys1111-1112 Textbook Committee

### Renovated Classroom and Studio Physics

As part of the department’s efforts to improve introductory physics education, Room 500 Classroom South is currently under renovation. The room is being transformed into a classroom in the studio model (integrated lecture and laboratory). The room will have 6 round tables for 9 students each. Each group of three students will have a computer. Following techniques proven by physics education research, pedagogical approaches emphasizing active learning and group interaction will be used. In the Fall 2008 semester only one integrated lecture and lab will offered. The remaining classes in this room will be lecture only with a separate lab (same as currently done). Over the course of about two years the number of studio classes will be increased until the room is used for only integrated lecture/lab courses. The interactive engagement techniques being adopted have been shown by physics education research to increase the critical thinking skills of the students. The department expects this classroom to increasingly impact the success of our students critical thinking abilities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Critical Thinking in General Education targets have been mostly met and fairly stable over the last three years. Scores in the calculus-based physics courses, Phys2211 and Phys2212, have generally been higher than in the algebra-based physics sequence, Phys1111 and Phys1112, and also higher than the scores in the astronomy sequence, Astr1010 and Astr1020. The use of a textbook which incorporates the results of physics education research may be part of the reason. This textbook was adopted in 2004.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Critical Thinking Assessment targets were not met (although very close) for Phys1111 and Astr1010. No substantial improvement has been observed over the course of several years. Attention must be given to both the assessment instruments being used and in the curricular and pedagogical choices and how they relate to critical thinking.
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 6: Critical Thinking: Future Research (M: 2, 3)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 7: Oral Communication (M: 3)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication

SLO 8: Written Communication (M: 2, 3)
Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication

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
6 Quantitative Skills

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
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 11: Computer Skills (M: 2, 3)
Students effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

SLO 12: Research Equipment Skills (M: 2, 3)
Students effectively use appropriate specialized research equipment.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Physics Core (O: 9, 10)
Physics Majors take a number of required courses in their junior and senior years that cover the content in the Physics and Math Core. The core content courses are Phys3401/3402 (Modern Physics I and II), Phys3850 (Statistical and Thermal Physics), Phys4600 (Classical Mechanics), and Phys4700 (Electricity and Magnetism). The outcomes are assessed by the instructors for each of the core courses by rating each student on each outcomes with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

Target for O9: Core Knowledge Content
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Five to eight students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 4.2 out of 5.0 was given for Outcome 9, Core Knowledge Content, and a rating of 4.0 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Five to eight students were rated in each of the core physics courses. An average rating of 4.2 out of 5.0 was given for Outcome 9, Core Knowledge Content, and a rating of 4.0 out of 5.0 for Outcome 10, Application of Knowledge.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research 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.
The capstone of the physics bachelor's degree program is Phys4950, Senior Research. In this course students work in the research lab of a professor (within Physics and Astronomy or another department) to perform a research project. The project is one that is integrated with the ongoing research done in that group and may lead to the student being part of a presentation at a scientific conference or an article in a scientific journal. It is meant to prepare students for graduate work or a career in corporate research and development or basic research. The student participates in research group interaction (e.g. group meetings) over the course of the project. At the conclusion of the project, the student presents his/her results as a written and oral report. The outcomes are assessed by the faculty mentor overseeing the students senior research project by rating the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

### Target for O1: Collaboration

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 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 - 4.4 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 9, Critical Thinking - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Teamwork - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.

### Target for O2: Contemporary Issues

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 5.0 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Teamwork - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Teamwork - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Teamwork - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 out of 5.0.
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Two 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.5 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 - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 5.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 5.0 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*
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.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: September 30, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Department Assessment Committee

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.

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

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.

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

Department Curriculum Changes

One outcome in which these assessments show low performance is written communication. The department is in the process of restructuring its lab and research courses in accordance with the Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) initiative. Beginning in the Fall of 2008, students in the BS in physics program will have to complete a three credit hour Advanced Physics Laboratory course and a three credit hour Research Project, each with an emphasis on scientific writing. In addition, as CTW courses they will emphasize elements of critical thinking. The departmental definition of critical thinking is in alignment with a number of our learning outcomes for the BS in physics, especially outcomes 3-6. These new courses have been approved by the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee. The curriculum changes to the physics BS program will be submitted for approval during Fall 2008. The new courses will be taught for the first time in the 2009/2010 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
**Engage Faculty**

A department faculty meeting will be held in which the results of the last three 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Over the assessment period (2007/2008 academic year), 8 students received B.S. degrees in Physics. Overall targets were generally met and in the few occurrence where they were not met, the assessments were only slightly below the targets. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point (core courses (5-8), junior labs (8), and senior research(2)), accurate measures of student learning outcomes will required averaging over several years. Averages over three years reveal high ratings in the program in outcomes 3-7 related to critical thinking in the scientific process and in outcomes 11 and 12 related to computer and research skills. Together these indicate a program strength related to research skills and preparation for careers in research.

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

Outcome 8, Written Communication, rated only 4.0 out of 5.0 for the Modern Physics Lab and 3.5 out of 5.0 for Senior Research.

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department’s mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration (M: 3)**

Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

**SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 2, 4)**

Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.
| **SLO 3:** Formulate Research Questions (M: 2, 4) | Students develop research questions appropriate for research. |
| **SLO 4:** Data Collection (M: 2, 4) | Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions. |
| **SLO 5:** Data Analysis (M: 2, 4) | Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions. |
| **SLO 6:** Future Research (M: 2, 4) | Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions. |
| **SLO 7:** 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 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) | Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics. |
| **SLO 10:** Math Skills and Application (M: 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 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: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 2.9 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Eight 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 - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 2.9 out of 5.0.

**M 2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Data Collection**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Future Research**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 out of 5.0.

**Target for O7: Oral Communication**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication – 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics and Astronomy Principles - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.9 out of 5.0.

M 3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
One Physics M.S. student was rated by his/her 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
One Physics M.S. student was rated by his/her 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
One Physics M.S. student was rated by his/her 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
One Physics M.S. student was rated by his/her 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
One Physics M.S. student was rated by his/her 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 - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.0 out of 5.0.

M 4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O3: Formulate Research Questions**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O4: Data Collection**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O5: Data Analysis**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O6: Future Research**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O8: Written Communication**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for **O9: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research – 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication – 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Three Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 12 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 - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Formulate Research Questions - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.8 out of 5.0; 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.

Target for O10: Math Skills and Application

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills and Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Advisor</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Skills</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Committee General Examination</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Committee Research Paper</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: September 30, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chairman Dick Miller and Departmental Assessment Committee

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. Particular attention will be paid to the Astronomy Qualifying Examination and changes will be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Skills and Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Advisor</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Skills</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Committee General Examination</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Physics Committee Research Paper</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Core Physics and Astronomy Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brian Thoms

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 (2007/2008 academic year), 3 students received M.S. degrees in Physics. Students MS committees rated them very highly in all areas in this assessment period, much higher than in the previous two years. The only low scores were in Mathematical Skills as measured in the Astronomy Qualifying Exam and in Written Communication as measured by the Research Advisor (however only one student was evaluated as part of that measure). The Physics M.S. is generally performing well and meeting targets. It should be noted that the ratings of MS students by their committees as measured by their research paper and their general examination have improved dramatically. Although this is hard to interpret since it involves only 3 students, it may also be attributable to the increased attention given the MS paper and presentations following last years faculty discussion. The compilation of findings over the three years of assessment shows that students’ committees rate their learning outcomes highly across the board, but that research advisors are harsher in their assessment particularly in the areas of written and oral communication.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The 2007/2008 assessments show no consistent weaknesses. Low ratings for Mathematical Skills in the Astronomy Qualifying Exam and Written Communication in the Research Advisor's evaluation are not reflected in the assessments of the MS committees. Poor statistics for this year's evaluation by Research Advisors may be indicate that this low rating is not a systematic issue. The low ratings observed in the Astronomy Qualifying Exam are also apparent in the three year average. Since the ratings for the same measures are much better as reflected in the Research Paper and General Examination, a problem with the assessment tool in the Qualifying Exam may be indicated.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The department is an integral part of the University mission of education, research, and public service. In particular, the department's mission in these three areas is Education: To provide our students with the skills and knowledge to be successful practitioners and leaders in their field. To prepare students for long-term success in fast-changing areas of research and technological development. Research: To extend our current understanding in a variety of sub-fields of physics and astronomy by performing state-of-the-art research. To collaborate with other departments and institutions in cutting edge research. To prepare students to perform and direct state-of-the-art research in individual and collaborative environments. Service: To support other programs within the university through training in physics and astronomy. To work with local, state, and national communities in communicating the roles and benefits of physics and astronomy in our lives.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Data Collection (M: 1, 2)
Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions.

SLO 2: Data Analysis (M: 1, 2)
Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions.

SLO 3: Future Research Questions (M: 1, 2)
Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 4: Oral Communication (M: 2, 3)
Students communicate effectively orally in a context relevant to scientific research, such as a scientific meeting, conference, or colloquium.

SLO 5: Written Communication (M: 1, 3)
Students communicate effectively in writing in a context relevant to scientific research, such as scientific journals.

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.
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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 out of 5.0.

**Target for O2: Data Analysis**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Written Communication**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 out of 5.0.
Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.1 out of 5.0.

**M2: Committee Presentation and Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12)**

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, scientific process, oral communication skills, and physics and math knowledge. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty.

**Target for O1: Data Collection**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O2: Data Analysis**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Future Research Questions**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation document. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Oral Communication**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Five Physics Ph.D. students were rated by their committees (18 assessments performed) after successful completion of their dissertation and defense. The following ratings are based the dissertation presentation and oral defense. Average ratings for each of the outcomes were given as follows: Outcome 2, Contemporary Issues - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 3, Research Questions - 4.5 out of 5.0; Outcome 4, Data Collection - 4.7 out of 5.0; Outcome 5, Data Analysis - 4.4 out of 5.0; Outcome 6, Future Research - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.1 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 9, Core Physics Principles - 3.9 out of 5.0; Outcome 10, Math Skills and Application - 4.5 out of 5.0.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Target for O6: Core Physics Principles
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Target for O7: Math Skills and Application
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Target for O11: Motivations and Implications of Research
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Target for O12: Formulate Research Questions
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Target for O4: Oral Communication
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Target for O5: Written Communication
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Five 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 - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O8: Computer Skills**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Five 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 - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Five 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 - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O10: Collaboration**

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Five 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 - 4.2 out of 5.0; Outcome 7, Oral Communication - 4.6 out of 5.0; Outcome 8, Written Communication - 4.0 out of 5.0; Outcome 11, Computer Skills - 4.8 out of 5.0; Outcome 12, Research Equipment - 4.8 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eleven 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 - 4.1 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Eleven 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 - 4.1 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
- Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research Questions | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Written Communication
- Measure: Committee Presentation and Defense | Outcome/Objective: Core Physics Principles
- Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research Questions | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Oral Communication
**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:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Committee Dissertation  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics Principles  
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research Questions | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Written Communication
- **Measure:** Committee Presentation and Defense  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics Principles  
  Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulate Research Questions | Future Research Questions | Math Skills and Application | Motivations and Implications of Research | Oral Communication
- **Measure:** Physics Qualifying Exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Core Physics Principles  
  Math Skills and Application
- **Measure:** Research Advisor  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration  
  Computer Skills | Oral Communication | Specialized Research Equipment | Written Communication

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Brian Thoms

**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 (2007/2008 academic year), five students received Ph.D. degrees in Physics. Findings for all measures of all learning outcomes were 3.9 out of 5.0 or above. Only two findings were below target values as discussed below. The highest scores (4.7 or above) were found for Data Collection, Computer Skills and Specialized Equipment Skills indicating a program strength in educating practicing researchers. Since we have small numbers of students involved at each assessment point, accurate measures of student learning outcomes will require averaging over several years. A compilation of assessment data for three years (covering 10 completed PhDs) shows findings between 4.1 and 4.7 out of 5.0 for all measures of all learning outcomes.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The only areas which fell below departmental targets for any measures in the 2007/2008 assessment were Written Communication and Core Knowledge Content. Written Communication was rated an average score of 3.9 out of 5.0 by the PhD committees using the dissertation and 4.0 by the research advisors using a broader range of written evidence. The PhD committees rated Core Knowledge Content with an average score of 3.9 as measured from the student dissertation defenses but 4.2 out of 5.0 as measured by the dissertation document itself. The three year averages for these two learning outcomes range from 4.1 to 4.4 out of 5.0.
5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 2: Analytical skills (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and empirical explanations of political behavior.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 3: Communication skills (M: 2)**

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 relevant and meaningful conclusions from findings.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Analytic Skills (O: 2)**

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 communication assignments in the lower division.

**Target for O2: Analytical skills**

The targeted outcome is students demonstrate analytical skills by being able to answer key questions on core exams at a rate of 70% or better

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Both syllabi and exams from multiple sections of PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 directly and consistently address the learning outcome falling under the heading of analytic skills. Syllabi and exams for PolS 1101 focus on critical thinking relating to 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. Syllabi and exams for PolS 2401 focus on critical thinking relating to 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 of record. It also typically includes other disciplinary perspectives when analyzing these issues, such as economics, history, anthropology, area studies, sociology, and so on. Of the ten critical questions in Pol S 1101 the percentage of students getting correct answers in the fall semester 2007 ranged from a low of 60% to a high of 87%. Students were able to answer five questions at a rate of 70% or above. Five fell between 60% and 68%. For the spring semester the percentage of correct answers ranged from one question with 38% correct to 83% correct. For the spring semester, students scored 70% or higher on six of the ten common questions. Clearly the department needs to improve to meet the targeted goal. We will now be able to develop a time series to examine performance on these questions. However, two things must be noted. First as a mandatory course the range of interest in an introductory course in American politics is enormous with “political junkies” who daily watch C Span to students who have never before been asked to read a newspaper. Second, the best students often come into Georgia State already having Advanced Placement credit in Introduction to American Politics, and hence their performance is never measured in our findings. Of the ten critical questions in Pol S 2401 the percentage of students getting correct answers in the fall semester 2007 ranged from a low of 62% to a high of 94%. Students were able to answer six questions at a rate of 70% or above. Five fell between 62% and 69%. For the spring semester the percentage of correct answers ranged from 5% correct to 93.5% correct. For the spring semester, students scored 70% or higher on nine of the ten common questions. Again while the department seeks improvement to meet our targeted goal, the department is quite pleased with these results. Since Pol S 2401 is mandatory for our majors the improved performance undoubtedly reflects the strength of our undergraduate majors.

**M 2: Communication Skills (O: 3)**

The assessment of this learning outcome is conducted in the same manner as goal #2 analytic skills, involving an evaluation of class assignments.

**Target for O3: Communication skills**

The targeted outcome is students are afforded the opportunity to demonstrate communication skills during class exercises and this form a component of the overall classroom experience and grade

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Examined syllabi for both PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 focus on the development of student communication skills. Students must read newspapers and other current material and take debate positions and be prepared to defend such positions in class. 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
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve analytic skills**

The Department is committed to improve analytic and critical thinking skills in the core curriculum. Continued and accelerated use of Supplemental Instructors and advisement should significantly aid in achieving desired outcome.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:**
Beginning of Fall semester 2008

**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Department Undergraduate Committee

Additional Resource/Measure:
- The department needs continued funding for Supplemental Instruction and for advisement, including a staff person dedicated to undergraduate advising. In addition, continued staffing to allow smaller sections should aid in learning and development of skills. Funding for FY09 is available through the RPG grant, but those funds need to be used towards the necessary gains.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The strength of the political science core curriculum shows a very strong group of teachers that have the ability to impart substantive knowledge over very broad subject areas - to wit, American Government and Global Issues to a very diverse student body. American Government in particular is a very difficult subject because the range of interests is extremely varied among the students and because the subject matter is so broad. Given the large numbers of students per section and that the "best" students come in with Advanced Placement credit and do not take this class the high passing rate and strong average grade are a testament to the strength of the teaching.

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

While our students are meeting substantive knowledge requirements the one half of the key questions in American government and forty percent of the key questions in Global Issues did not meet our threshold of 70% correct. The department needs to continue its use of Supplemental Instruction and should continue to work towards a goal of smaller sections for both Pol S 1101 and Pol S 2401.

This is, of course, dependent on resources being allocated for additional staffing. Obviously this requires continued attention to certain facets of knowledge and continued attention to training our students to think analytically and be able to answer more than just...
knowledge based questions and instead answer questions requiring comparisons and thinking skills.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Political Science BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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 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 subfields of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Public Administration/Policy. We offer specific concentrations in prelaw education and in International Relations. The BA program in Political Science endeavors to ensure that students get broad exposure to these fields. 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: Substantive Knowledge–Structures and Processes (M: 1)
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
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Substantive Knowledge–Global Perspectives (M: 1)
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
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Analytical Skills–Distinguishing Behaviors (M: 2)
Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Analytical Skills—Appropriate Use of Evidence (M: 3)**

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**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Effective Communication (M: 4)**

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
2 Oral Communication
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major (M: 5)**

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**

4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Substantive Knowledge—Structures and Processes (O: 1, 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 PolS 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 O1: Substantive Knowledge–Structures and Processes

The Department seeks evidence that syllabi in Area H are in conformity with the goals of teaching core concepts, structures, and processes of US and Georgia government, comparative politics, international relations, public administration and political theory. The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Papers collected by the DUGS during senior audits were used to provide assessment material for this learning objective. Response rate significantly improved from prior years, with almost all seniors submitting a paper. This appears to be due to three factors: communication between the department and graduating seniors has improved through the use of departmental email list; communication has been improved through faculty advisors for all majors and the requirement of a final paper prior to signing a graduation audit. In a welcome development, more students turned in extensive research papers as opposed to shorter essays than in prior years. This is a welcome change and will be encouraged. This allows greater comparison of the ability to distinguish normative from empirical reasoning and argumentation and the ability to appropriately use evidence. In short the undertaking of a research paper as a required part of the upper division major political science class teaches and reinforces the difference between normative and empirical explanations of political behavior and institutions. There still is an unwanted degree of variation in quality as related to these

Target for O2: Substantive Knowledge–Global Perspectives

The Department seeks evidence that syllabi in Area H are in conformity with the goals of teaching core concepts, structures, and processes of US and Georgia government, comparative politics, international relations, public administration and political theory. The Department targets major pass rates (i.e. a grade of C or better) of no less than 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Response rate significantly improved from prior years, with almost all seniors submitting a paper. This appears to be due to three factors: communication between the department and graduating seniors has improved through the use of departmental email list; communication has been improved through faculty advisors for all majors and the requirement of a final paper prior to signing a graduation audit. In a welcome development, more students turned in extensive research papers as opposed to shorter essays than in prior years. This is a welcome change and will be encouraged. This allows greater comparison of the ability to distinguish normative from empirical reasoning and argumentation and the ability to appropriately use evidence. In short the undertaking of a research paper as a required part of the upper division major political science class teaches and reinforces the difference between normative and empirical explanations of political behavior and institutions. There still is an unwanted degree of variation in quality as related to these

M 2: Analytical Skills–Distinguishing Behaviors (O: 3)

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 O3: Analytical Skills–Distinguishing Behaviors

The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

Findings 2007-2008 - 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 prior years, with almost all seniors submitting a paper. This appears to be due to three factors: communication between the department and graduating seniors has improved through the use of departmental email list; communication has been improved through faculty advisors for all majors and the requirement of a final paper prior to signing a graduation audit. In a welcome development, more students turned in extensive research papers as opposed to shorter essays than in prior years. This is a welcome change and will be encouraged. This allows greater comparison of the ability to distinguish normative from empirical reasoning and argumentation and the ability to appropriately use evidence. In short the undertaking of a research paper as a required part of the upper division major political science class teaches and reinforces the difference between normative and empirical explanations of political behavior and institutions. 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 and not all papers received had a grade on them, making it difficult for the Director of Undergraduate Studies to evaluate them without more requirements of the assignment requirements and grading criteria of the instructors for whom the papers were written.

### M 3: Analytical Skills–Appropriate Use of Evidence (O: 4)
The department has instituted compulsory writing assignments in all upper division courses. In order to assess the achievement of students in regard to the goal of appropriate use of empirical evidence, the Department will require students to present at the time of their senior audit their best paper written in a political science class. Such papers will be used by the Department to assess its success in achieving this desired learning outcome.

#### Target for O4: Analytical Skills–Appropriate Use of Evidence
The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - 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 prior years, with almost all seniors submitting a paper. This appears to be due to three factors: communication between the department and graduating seniors has improved through the use of departmental email lists; communication has improved between faculty and students through the use of faculty advisers for all majors and the requirement of a final paper prior to signing a graduation audit. While few papers had an original articulated claim, the vast majority of the papers demonstrated a clear statement or point of view through the thesis. Most of the papers were then able to use most of the evidence to support the thesis. It is clear that the students graduate with the ability to appropriately use evidence to support claims.

### M 4: Effective Communication (O: 5)
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 O5: Effective Communication
The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In writing assignments effective communication is demonstrated through the ability to articulate a clear thesis and then support the thesis through appropriate use of evidence. While few papers had an original articulated claim, the vast majority of the papers demonstrated a clear statement or point of view through the thesis. A review of syllabi by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Undergraduate Committee shows that for almost all upper division classes, class participation is an important component of both the teaching and grading process. In several classes students are required to present research findings to the class or to lead the class in discussions or readings.

### M 5: Methodological Skills (O: 6)
The assessment of this learning outcome involves evaluating syllabi, exams and evaluations from PolS 3800 (Introduction to Political Research), a course required of all political science majors.

#### Target for O6: Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major
The Department targets 100% success in producing graduates who meet this objective.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
A review of syllabi by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Undergraduate Committee shows that PolS emphasizes learning methodological and quantitative skills. Students are taught the fundamentals of research design, the development of theory and hypotheses, how to gather data and other evidence and how to apply such evidence to test the hypotheses and argue for the theory. In the three sections of 3800 offered spring semester 2008, 88 % of students scored a “C” or better. In addition the average grade was a high “C.” This represents an improvement over prior years. This is very impressive considering PolS 3800 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 the grade distribution is similar to the research methods courses required in other departments, such as Sociology and Economics and that the “C” or better variance will continue in 3800 for the foreseeable future. To supplement the Department's own self-evaluation with the views of our own students, we have collected spring 2008 average scores from selected questions on all student evaluation surveys from PolS 3800. The questions were the key questions from the survey, the average scores were as follows: Q1 (Q1): Course goals were described clearly. Q2 (Q5): Instructor was well prepared. Q3 (Q6): Instructor communicated in an understandable manner. Q4 (Q13): Instructor stimulated student thinking. Q5 (Q17): Overall instructor effectiveness. Total N Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 PolS 3800 122 4.47 4.37 4.40 4.30 4.37

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

#### Experiential Learning
The Department should consider ways to evaluate non-course learning experiences and related data in the overall undergraduate program instruction assessment process, such as internships, directed study projects, Model UN/Model Arab League, Mock Trial, study abroad programs, and similar programs. These are very popular with our political science majors and the Department has enjoyed considerable success in terms of competitions with other institutions. As such experiences may play a significant role in our training of undergraduate students for future careers in law, diplomacy, or international business the Department should begin thinking of ways to incorporate measures of participation and success in our assessment goals and processes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
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 their 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 a 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—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—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
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 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: 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: 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 advisement 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
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

Analytical Skills

The Department is committed to improving analytic and critical thinking skills in the major. Continued emphasis on writing skills to develop and understand the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior and to assess evidence using principles of logical analysis and be able to apply that evidence when making conclusions is a high priority. The development of small sections of PolS 3800 and the development of 4000 level senior seminars should significantly aid in achieving the desired outcome. The department needs resources to ensure that each writing intensive course be limited to no more than 25 students per instructor. The department has experienced significant growth in the number of majors over the past several years and the department’s forthcoming CTW courses will also be open to several BIS Interdisciplinary majors seeking to fulfill CTW requirements including those students in Middle Eastern Studies and Law and Society. Thus it is critical that resources be allocated to ensure the success of these courses. In addition the department has sought both to improve the papers and to reward the best students through a writing competition. Continued funding of the competition will also help push students to achieve their best.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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?

The strength of the political science major shows a very strong group of teachers that have the ability to impart substantive knowledge over very broad subject areas, teach critical thinking, analytical and methodological skills. The department notes the improvement in both the number and quality of final papers, and the number of papers employing various methodological techniques. Papers submitted ranged from those engaged in doctrinal analysis to the use of multiple regression.

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

While the department does an impressive job of educating majors and developing critical thinking, analytic, communication and methodological skills the variation in the quality of papers submitted indicates a continued need to focus on thinking skills related to writing. Continued growth in the number of faculty to allow twenty five students per CTW course and funding of competitions is critical.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA students should demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects (O: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Our MA students completed seven theses and six non-thesis papers in academic year 2007-08. Members of each thesis or non-thesis committee were asked to evaluate the student’s project for in terms of the degree to which the project demonstrates achievement of the department’s stated learning objectives. With the exception of one non-thesis paper, all of the thesis and non-thesis projects were judged to have met the department’s learning objectives. Three of the seven thesis projects were judged to have been of the highest quality in terms of their contribution to the department’s learning objectives. Looking at the assessments as a group, there is a clear and not surprising gap between the quality of the thesis and nonthesis papers. It is not possible to discern any consistent pattern of outcomes on the specific learning objectives, either when taking all of the thesis and nonthesis projects together, or when looking at the two types of projects separately. Variations in the degree to which projects meet learning objectives seem to be related more to individual students’ strengths and weaknesses than to systematic weaknesses in student training. As in previous years, writers of non-thesis papers have tended to spring their projects on their advisers very close to the deadline, which weakens the quality of these projects. This might be remedied by requiring the submission of at least two drafts for the nonthesis paper. Last year the deadline for submission of the nonthesis paper to match the thesis deadline, with no noticeable impact on nonthesis project quality. In the coming year, two deadlines will be enforced for each of two drafts, a rough and final draft.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Our MA students completed seven theses and six non-thesis papers in academic year 2007-08. Members of each thesis or non-thesis committee were asked to evaluate the student’s project for in terms of the degree to which the project demonstrates achievement of the department’s stated learning objectives. With the exception of one non-thesis paper, all of the thesis and non-thesis projects were judged to have met the department’s learning objectives. Three of the seven thesis projects were judged to have been of the highest quality in terms of their contribution to the department’s learning objectives. Looking at the assessments as a group, there is a clear and not surprising gap between the quality of the thesis and nonthesis papers. It is not possible to discern any consistent pattern of outcomes on the specific learning objectives, either when taking all of the thesis and nonthesis projects together, or when looking at the two types of projects separately.

Variations in the degree to which projects meet learning objectives seem to be related more to individual students’ strengths and weaknesses than to systematic weaknesses in student training. As in previous years, writers of non-thesis papers have tended to spring their projects on their advisers very close to the deadline, which weakens the quality of these projects. This might be remedied by requiring the submission of at least two drafts for the nonthesis paper. Last year the deadline for submission of the nonthesis paper to match the thesis deadline, with no noticeable impact on nonthesis project quality. In the coming year, two deadlines will be enforced for each of two drafts, a rough and final draft.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Our MA students completed seven theses and six non-thesis papers in academic year 2007-08. Members of each thesis or non-thesis committee were asked to evaluate the student’s project for in terms of the degree to which the project demonstrates achievement of the department’s stated learning objectives. With the exception of one non-thesis paper, all of the thesis and non-thesis projects were judged to have met the department’s learning objectives. Three of the seven thesis projects were judged to have been of the highest quality in terms of their contribution to the department’s learning objectives. Looking at the assessments as a group, there is a clear and not surprising gap between the quality of the thesis and nonthesis papers. It is not possible to discern any consistent pattern of outcomes on the specific learning objectives, either when taking all of the thesis and nonthesis projects together, or when looking at the two types of projects separately.

Variations in the degree to which projects meet learning objectives seem to be related more to individual students’ strengths and weaknesses than to systematic weaknesses in student training. As in previous years, writers of non-thesis papers have tended to spring their projects on their advisers very close to the deadline, which weakens the quality of these projects. This might be remedied by requiring the submission of at least two drafts for the nonthesis paper. Last year the deadline for submission of the nonthesis paper to match the thesis deadline, with no noticeable impact on nonthesis project quality. In the coming year, two deadlines will be enforced for each of two drafts, a rough and final draft.

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):
- Mastery of Relevant Research Literature | 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):
- Mastery of Relevant Research Literature | Use of Appropriate Research Skills

Implementation Description: Immediate
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director/chair

Monthly graduate research colloquium
The Director of Graduate Studies will convene a required monthly research colloquium for all students registered for thesis research hours, as described in the Action Plan.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Thesis and Nonthesis Committee Members

---

**Two-draft requirement for non-thesis papers.**
In the coming year, two deadlines will be enforced for each of two drafts, a rough and final draft. The first deadline will be the midpoint of the semester in which the student expects to graduate. The final deadline will be the deadline established by the Graduate Office of the College of Arts and Sciences for completion of all degree requirements.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
**Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies, Nonthesis committee members

---

**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 by and large, MA students are achieving the department's stated learning objectives. Thesis projects tend to meet the objectives to a higher degree than nonthesis projects.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
Looking at the assessments of MA projects as a group, it is not possible to discern any consistent pattern of outcomes on the specific learning objectives, either when taking all of the thesis and nonthesis projects together, or when looking at the two types of projects separately. Variations in the degree to which projects meet learning objectives seem to be related more to individual students’ strengths and weaknesses than to systematic weaknesses in student training. There is a clear and to some degree expected gap between the quality of the theses and the nonthesis papers. As in previous years, writers of non-thesis papers have tended to spring their projects on their advisers very close to the deadline, which weakens the quality of these projects. This might be remedied by requiring the submission of at least two drafts for the nonthesis paper. Last year the deadline for submission of the nonthesis paper to match the thesis deadline, with no noticeable impact on nonthesis project quality. In the coming year, two deadlines will be enforced for each of two drafts, a rough and final draft. In addition, the Director of Graduate Studies will convene a required monthly study group for all students registered for thesis research hours, as described in the Action Plan.

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (M: 1, 2, 4)**
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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (M: 1, 4)
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
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (M: 1, 4)
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
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (M: 3)
Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)
The members of each doctoral dissertation committee will individually provide to the Director of Graduate Studies a written assessment stating the degree to which the dissertation and its defense indicate success in achievement of the program’s stated learning outcomes.

##### Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others’ work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

##### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Two dissertations were successfully defended this year. Both dissertations met the department’s goals for learning outcomes, according to the members of each committee. Each represented an original contribution to the student’s subfield and demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and the field and use of appropriate research methods. However, while one dissertation was satisfactory on all counts, the other was exemplary and exceeded expectations on all aspects of the performance evaluation. The dissertation proposal had earned the student a National Science Foundation dissertation improvement grant, and the student created a rich dataset and employed sophisticated methods to produce a fine piece of research, amply demonstrating this student’s potential as a scholar. The second dissertation was a less virtuoso performance, but still met the department’s learning outcomes.

##### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Two dissertations were successfully defended this year. Both dissertations met the department’s goals for learning outcomes, according to the members of each committee. Each represented an original contribution to the student’s subfield and demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and the field and use of appropriate research methods. However, while one dissertation was satisfactory on all counts, the other was exemplary and exceeded expectations on all aspects of the performance evaluation. The dissertation proposal had earned the student a National Science Foundation dissertation improvement grant, and the student created a rich dataset and employed sophisticated methods to produce a fine piece of research, amply demonstrating this student’s potential as a scholar. The second dissertation was a less virtuoso performance, but still met the department’s learning outcomes.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Two dissertations were successfully defended this year. Both dissertations met the department’s goals for learning outcomes, according to the members of each committee. Each represented an original contribution to the student’s subfield and demonstrated a good understanding of the literature and the field and use of appropriate research methods. However, while one dissertation was satisfactory on all counts, the other was exemplary and exceeded expectations on all aspects of the performance evaluation. The dissertation proposal had earned the student a National Science Foundation dissertation improvement grant, and the student created a rich dataset and employed sophisticated methods to produce a fine piece of research, amply demonstrating this student’s potential as a scholar. The second dissertation was a less virtuoso performance, but still met the department’s learning outcomes.

**M 2: Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2)**

Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the discipline.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

The department considers this goal to have been partially met. During the 2007-08 academic year, ten students took comprehensive exams: 4 in the fall, and 6 in the spring. Two of the four fall exams were retakes and both students passed. The other two students taking exams in the fall each failed one of their three exams and had to retake these in the spring. Of the 6 students who took exams in the spring, both students doing retakes passed; two passed all exams on their first try; one failed one exam out of three; and another failed all three exams. This last student transferred in from Finland and had taken the bare minimum of courses required with us before taking her comps. Overall, 72% of the comprehensive exams turned in this academic year were graded as satisfactory. This is roughly consistent with the pass rate of the previous two years. Sample of readers’ comments on passing exams: "The answers are generally well written, display a satisfactory command of the breadth and depth of the Comparative Politics literature,..." "The essays generally offer clear, straightforward, and defensible answers to the questions, they contain some interesting ideas, and they demonstrate a good command of the relevant literatures. Overall the exam is occasionally vague on specific details, but very good at getting to what the questions are really asking and demonstrating the kind of well-rounded thinking about research problems that a social scientist should learn." Sampling of readers’ comments on exams rated inadequate: "This essay begins well but runs out of steam before successfully answering the question. It would have been much stronger had the author elaborated more on the criticisms and been able to cover more of the relevant literature. There are also some questionable claims." "This essay is somewhat incoherent – it begins by raising good points and employs relevant sources, but does not pull together a clear argument. It would not be easy to guess what question this essay is answering."

**Target for O2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield**

The department considers this goal to have been partially met. During the 2007-08 academic year, ten students took comprehensive exams: 4 in the fall, and 6 in the spring. Two of the four fall exams were retakes and both students passed. The other two students taking exams in the fall each failed one of their three exams and had to retake these in the spring. Of the 6 students who took exams in the spring, both students doing retakes passed; two passed all exams on their first try; one failed one exam out of three; and another failed all three exams. This last student transferred in from Finland and had taken the bare minimum of courses required with us before taking her comps. Overall, 72% of the comprehensive exams turned in this academic year were graded as satisfactory. This is roughly consistent with the pass rate of the previous two years. Sample of readers’ comments on passing exams: "The answers are generally well written, display a satisfactory command of the breadth and depth of the Comparative Politics literature,..." "The essays generally offer clear, straightforward, and defensible answers to the questions, they contain some interesting ideas, and they demonstrate a good command of the relevant literatures. Overall the exam is occasionally vague on specific details, but very good at getting to what the questions are really asking and demonstrating the kind of well-rounded thinking about research problems that a social scientist should learn."
the kind of well-rounded thinking about research problems that a social scientist should learn.” Sampling of readers’ comments on exams rated inadequate: “This essay begins well but runs out of steam before successfully answering the question. It would have been much stronger had the author elaborated more on the criticisms and been able to cover more of the relevant literature. There are also some questionable claims.” “This essay is somewhat incoherent – it begins by raising good points and employs relevant sources, but does not pull together a clear argument. It would not be easy to guess what question this essay is answering.”

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Eighteen graduate student instructors taught a total of 35 sections in fall and spring of academic year 2007-8. (20 sections in the fall were taught by 14 instructors; 15 sections were taught in the spring by 12 instructors). Sections ranged from large 1000 and 2000 level classes with more than 100 students per section to 3000 level classes with 50 students or fewer. Syllabi were examined and found to be substantially in compliance with departmental, College and University standards. Our doctoral students consistently received high marks in student evaluations. The average score for overall teaching effectiveness (question 17) was 4.1 for POLS 2401 (Global Issues) and 4.3 for POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics). These mean scores mask the fact that the majority of our instructors consistently rate higher than a 4.5 on most questions on student evaluations, including question 17. In the more specialized classes, students tended to rank their instructors even more favorably, averaging around a 4.3 for overall teaching effectiveness, across all of these classes. Student comments were overwhelmingly positive. Most impressive are those from students who found new or renewed interest in political science as a result of taking the class. This positive outcome is particularly important to the department, since POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 are feeders for our major and core curriculum courses. The most consistent negative comments concerned the textbook used for POLS 2401 (the same book is used by all grad student instructors per department policy). A new text has been introduced for the coming year. Other criticisms related to the management of classroom time, and several objected to instructors’ making their personal opinions known on political topics that were being discussed. Below are some representative comments from student evaluations: Positive: “Impressively knowledgeable about subject matter. Very encouraging to students who came to class and did the work, and fair to everyone.” “...a highly passionate and motivated instructor.” “She was a great professor and knew the subject matter inside and out despite crazy questions from around the class.” “...fantastic teacher who’s undoubtedly motivated by his love of the subject matter and determination to relay his knowledge to students.” “…she helped me like global issues.” “I enjoyed the class even though it was challenging.” “…one of the best professors I have ever had in my time at Georgia State. I have never learned so much from a class. This was my very first class within my major and I feel like it has really prepared me for the others to come.” “I came into the course intimidated, but the materials that she brings to class and readings we had honestly helped to understand a lot of current global issues I was unaware of.” “Initially I knew nothing about and despised political science. I now may consider minoring in it.” “She challenged me mentally and pushed me to continue my pursuit in obtaining a degree. She’s fair and works really hard at making sure her students retain what they learned.” “Great professor. Because of him, I now have a huge interest in political science.” “An extraordinary teacher. I hope to be as effective as her when I'm in front of the room.” “She just opened new horizons for me...a wonderful professor.” “No one in the class wanted to skip a class there was so much to learn from this instructor.” Negative: “He needs to break down the subject matter even more, so that the class can become more involved.” “Very knowledgeable, but the inundation of information was hard to manage.” Instructor “teaches effectively for passing the test. However, he is unduly harsh on grading presentations and paper...he is intimidating and unapproachable.” “I think that the amount of work expected of the students is a little overwhelming.” “...it's very easy to see her passion and/or interest in the subject, as well as disappointment when we didn’t share the same views.” “…when a student said something [instructor] didn’t agree with, [instructor] merely waved him off and said that the comment was incorrect.” (Though another student in this same section said “[instructor] was very helpful and taught in an unbiased manner.”) [Specific to POLS 2401] “I really enjoyed the class, but the textbook was horrible. Worst textbook I’ve had thus far in college!” “Great teacher, awful text book.” As part of our assessment of teaching effectiveness, the department has also begun systematic observation and evaluation of grad student instructors by members of the faculty. Following are general comments from faculty observer for three different graduate instructors: “Overall I was very impressed with [instructor]’s grasp of the material and approach to pedagogy that relies on student centered learning through a variety of techniques (including very successful use of Socratic method). Teaching showed a great commitment to the students' learning process and I have little to add One point might be to make sure that students in last rows are more often called upon so that the student interactions don’t get appearance of front row discussions (this is a very minor point especially since I already noted that at least two students from back rows spoke up and addressed points/questions).” “Good attempt to draw students in by letting them ask questions but could herself ask more probing questions to make students show their understanding of concepts; (could have had students tell of their bureaucracy experiences; work experiences; rather than just assuming it; might allow for more student participation) Otherwise, very very good.” “Great explanation of Marbury v. Madison, really bringing court case to life and thus making it more interesting for students. Despite very good rapport, could be a little more assertive; it would also be a good idea to continue to refer to own sources in order to break up monotony of textbook b/c really shows students the continuing relevance of materials; Sometimes walks away from notes, gets stuck and has to return before continuing class.” Finally, we are pleased to report evidence of teaching effectiveness in the form of student achievements under the guidance of our graduate student instructors. This year, two students in Deborah Cotton's Global Issues classes have won college or university-wide awards for papers written in her classes. Deborah is a doctoral student serving as a grad student instructor. One of her students was awarded best undergraduate research paper in the College of Arts and Sciences, and Shamara Boines was runner up in the University Library Undergraduate Research competition for her paper "Should the U.S. Adopt British Policies in Fighting the War on Drugs?"

M 4: Conference presentations, publications, and grants (O: 1, 3, 4)

This measure gauges research competency and professional socialization by assessing the success of graduate students in placing their work at conferences and in publishing outlets and in attracting funding to support their research.

Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Grants, Awards and Fellowships: Vanja Petricovic has received a Fulbright Fellowship to conduct dissertation research on the European Union during 2008-09 in Belgium and Austria. She is also one of five recipients of the Belgian government’s Ministry of the Flemish Community Fellowship, worth approximately $13,000. As a Flemish Community Fellow, she will be placed at the University of Antwerp while completing fieldwork for her dissertation. These awards come on top of Vanja’s recent receipt of a Belgian American Educational Foundation Fellowship for 2008-09, as well as a grant from the Slovak Republic. She was one of 15 doctoral students selected from a worldwide competition for this grant. In February 2008 Pine Wang, a doctoral student in Political Science was awarded the GSU Dissertation Grant of $1,000. During the same time, he was also awarded the GSU William M. Suttles Graduate Research Fellowship of $2,000. This Fellowship is annually awarded to the best research project across all disciplines and his project was one of the only two projects awarded this year. The awarded funds enabled him to make the third trip to China in March to collect data for the dissertation as well as provided funding for two additional field trips conducted in 2007. Cynthia Michota was awarded the Graduate Democracy Fellowship from the Carter Center, which carries a $15,000 stipend for six months. As a Fellow, she has worked at the Carter Center on election issues. Her fellowship has been renewed for an additional six months, beginning July 2008. Josephine Dawuni, a doctoral student, received a $3000 dissertation travel grant from the West African Research Association to fund her dissertation fieldwork in Ghana. She was also awarded a conference travel grant to present her work at a migration workshop in Johannesburg, South Africa in July 2008. Shauna Reilly and faculty member Dr. Jeffrey Lazarus wrote a paper that was nominated for the Congressional Quarterly prize for the Legislative Section of the APSA for the 2007 APSA conference.


**Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Grants, Awards and Fellowships: Vanja Petricovic has received a Fulbright Fellowship to conduct dissertation research on the European Union during 2008-09 in Belgium and Austria. She is also one of five recipients of the Belgian government’s Ministry of the Flemish Community Fellowship, worth approximately $13,000. As a Flemish Community Fellow, she will be placed at the University of Antwerp while completing fieldwork for her dissertation. These awards come on top of Vanja’s recent receipt of a Belgian American Educational Foundation Fellowship for 2008-09, as well as a grant from the Slovak Republic. She was one of 15 doctoral students selected from a worldwide competition for this grant. In February 2008 Pine Wang, a doctoral student in Political Science was awarded the GSU Dissertation Grant of $1,000. During the same time, he was also awarded the GSU William M. Suttles Graduate Research Fellowship of $2,000. This Fellowship is annually awarded to the best research project across all disciplines and his project was one of the only two projects awarded this year. The awarded funds enabled him to make the third trip to China in March to collect data for the dissertation as well as provided funding for two additional field trips conducted in 2007. Cynthia Michota was awarded the Graduate Democracy Fellowship from the Carter Center, which carries a $15,000 stipend for six months. As a Fellow, she has worked at the Carter Center on election issues. Her fellowship has been renewed for an additional six months, beginning July 2008. Josephine Dawuni, a doctoral student, received a $3000 dissertation travel grant from the West African Research Association to fund her dissertation fieldwork in Ghana. She was also awarded a conference travel grant to present her work at a migration workshop in Johannesburg, South Africa in July 2008. Shauna Reilly and faculty member Dr. Jeffrey Lazarus wrote a paper that was nominated for the Congressional Quarterly prize for the Legislative Section of the APSA for the 2007 APSA conference.


**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Grants, Awards and Fellowships: Vanja Petricevic has received a Fulbright Fellowship to conduct dissertation research on the European Union during 2008-09 in Belgium and Austria. She is also one of five recipients of the Belgian government’s Ministry of the Flemish Community Fellowship, worth approximately $13,000. As a Flemish Community Fellow, she will be placed at the University of Antwerp while completing fieldwork for her dissertation. These awards come on top of Vanja’s recent receipt of a Belgian American Educational Foundation Fellowship for 2008-09, as well as a grant from the National Scholarship of the Slovak Republic. She was one of 15 doctoral students selected from a worldwide competition for this grant. In February 2008 Pine Wang, a doctoral student in Political Science was awarded the GSU Dissertation Grant of $1,000. During the same time, he was also awarded the GSU William M. Sutliff Graduate Research Fellowship of $2,000. This Fellowship is annually awarded to the best research project across all disciplines and his project was one of the only two projects awarded this year. The awarded funds enabled him to make the third trip to China in March to collect data for the dissertation as well as provided funding for two additional field trips conducted in 2007. Cynthia Michota was awarded the Graduate Democracy Fellowship from the Carter Center, which carries a $15,000 stipend for six months. As a Fellow, she has worked at the Carter Center on election issues. Her fellowship has been renewed for an additional six months, beginning July 2008. Josephine Dawuni, a doctoral student, received a $3000 dissertation travel grant from the West African Research Association to fund her dissertation fieldwork in Ghana. She was also awarded a conference travel grant to present her work at a migration workshop in Johannesburg, South Africa in July 2008. Shauna Reilly and faculty member Dr. Jeffrey Lazarus wrote a paper that was nominated for the Congressional Quarterly’s prize for the Legislative Section of the APSA for the 2007 APSA conference, “Party, Electoral Vulnerability, and Pork, 98th to 107th Congress.” Conference presentations: In all, our graduate students have presented 21 papers at professional conferences in the U.S. this year, including the major ones such as the American Political Science Association, the Midwestern Political Science Association. In addition, two students presented their work abroad. Xinsong Wang gave a lecture at Jiangxi Normal University’s College of Political Science and Law titled, “Introduction of Western Political Science Research Methods and Major Theoretical Development in Comparative Politics” in spring 2008. Josephine Dawuni presented her research at an international migration conference in Johannesburg, South Africa in July 2008. Publications: Josephine Dawuni, “Globalizing Voices: Ghanaian Women Respond to Globalization”, in Ayandiji D.Aina (2007), Corruption and the Challenge of Human Development, Ilishan-Remo: Babcock University Press pp.475-489. John S. Duffield with Cynthia Michota and Sara Ann Miller, “Alliances,” in Paul Williams, ed., Security Studies: An Introduction (NY: Routledge, 2008). Deborah Cotton, “The Magnificent Seve: Africa’s Response to U.S. Article 98,” African Human Rights Law Journal, 7/1 (2007). Deborah Cotton, Africa Rising: A Response to U.S. Article 98 and the International Criminal Court. (Saarbrucken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller, 2008). Based in part on his dissertation research, Xinsong Wang has written a policy paper assessing the development of grassroots democracy in rural China for the Carter Center’s China Program. The paper is included in the China Program’s writing project evaluating the prospective of Chinese democracy and will be published this year.

### 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 the mandatory exams. 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. Students 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 the mandatory exams.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in Second Field or Subfield  
- Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field  
**Implementation Description:** Immediate  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Chair/Director of Graduate Studies/Graduate Committee

#### Improving Teaching by Graduate Instructors

The Director of Graduate Studies and the coordinators for POLS 2401 and POLS 1101 should meet with graduate instructors at the beginning and end of each semester in an effort to further strengthen graduate instruction. Students expecting to teach one of these courses should be encouraged to participate 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 ENP 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 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. Students 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 the mandatory exams.
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. These practices will continue in the coming year, as we believe they will be effective over time.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
- Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

Implementation Description: Immediate
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director/chair

Include non-survey driven measures of assessment
The data presented for the first two annual learning outcome assessment reports has been based primarily on surveys of thesis and dissertation committees, as well as student evaluations. The current report attempts to bolster the findings with other kinds of data, including evidence of recognition of students’ work beyond the department. 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. During the coming year we will contemplate formalizing reporting on these other objectives and ways to capture them by incorporating a new measure or measures into the learning outcomes assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director and graduate committee, chair

Biannual Q&A Session on Preparing for Comps
Q&A sessions early in each semester for students planning to take comprehensive exams that semester. Students will have the opportunity to ask questions of the Director of Graduate Studies and selected faculty regarding the purpose and structure of comprehensive exams and recommended study strategies. They will also be able to meet other students with whom they might form study groups.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Comprehensive Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
- Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

Implementation Description: September 2008 and February 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Monthly research colloquia for graduate students
Beginning Fall 2008, students registered for thesis or dissertation research hours will be required to participate in monthly research colloquia led by the Director of Graduate Studies. Each participant will present his/her work at least one time per semester to receive critiques from fellow students and invited faculty. Invited faculty will also give presentations on particular aspects of the research enterprise -- the literature review, identifying a research question, case selection, methodological choices, etc.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization

Implementation Description: August 2008
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?
Consistent with previous years, the department continues to demonstrate its strength in the training of effective teachers and has made strides in the training of research scholars. The department graduated two PhDs this year, one of whom has accepted a tenure-track position at the University of Western Kentucky. Several past graduates of the doctoral program accepted tenure-track positions this year, including two at Kennesaw State and one at Agnes Scott College. In addition, a doctoral student who will graduate in the fall has accepted a visiting assistant professor position at Oglethorpe for the coming academic year. A review of teaching evaluations and syllabi of graduate student instructors provides clear evidence that the majority of our students are acquiring the teaching skills that will help them land jobs and offer innovative and effective classroom instruction. Mentoring of graduate students by faculty coordinators of POLS 1101 and POLS 2401, the main courses taught by grad students, has helped to boost the quality of instruction our students offer and aided in their professional socialization. Our doctoral students have continued to be very active in presenting and publishing their work, as noted in the Measures and Findings section. We are proud of their success in this regard and believe it shows clear evidence of their achievement of the key learning objectives defined by the department. In previous years’ reports we have noted a concern that graduate students make more timely progress toward the degree. A number of steps were taken to address this concern, including revision of the time limit for defending a successful dissertation proposal after completion of the comprehensive exams, limiting the number of credit hours that can be taken to achieve the required 3.4 GPA to take
comprehensive exams, and establishing a norm of four years of graduate funding for doctoral students, with additional funding possible depending on resource availability and students’ progress and performance. In addition, we instituted annual review of the progress of doctoral students who had passed their comprehensive exams. We believe these measures have helped to make graduate students and their advisers more keenly aware of students’ progress in the degree program and have established expectations that will help to guide students toward timely completion of the degree. We graduated two doctoral students between July 2007 and July 2008, and expect to graduate three more in Fall 2008.

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

Students’ performance on the comprehensive exams has been a major area of concern for the program in years past, and this continues to be the case. Early in the spring semester the Director of Graduate Studies organized a well-attended workshop for doctoral students on what to expect of comprehensive exams. A number of faculty members contributed advice to students on study strategies and expectations. Nevertheless, the pass rate this year was substantially the same as in the past two years. In line with measures already taken to improve the pass rate, faculty will continue to incorporate exercises into their classes that may improve students’ ability to meet the particular challenges of timed, wide ranging, closed book essay exams, as discussed in last year’s report. In addition, we plan to institutionalize comprehensive exam information sessions to be held at the beginning of each semester, in order to help students devised strategies to prepare effectively for exams.

---
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(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%
### 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%

### 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.

### 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%

### 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

### 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%.

### 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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Assurance skills
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Assurance skills

  **Implementation Description:** December 2006 just prior to start of Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** W.F. Messier, Jr.
**Additional Resources:** It would be nice to have a grader.

#### Communication skills
None planned at this time

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Terminated
- **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:** Terminated
- **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.
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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 8: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, & APA (M: 8, 10, 12)
Students will learn to apply the Ethical Guidelines of the Association for Specialists in Group Work, the American Counseling Association, and/or the American Psychological Association to advanced group leadership.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Co-leader functions (M: 8, 10)
Students will learn about co-leader functioning in advanced group leadership.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 11: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures (M: 8, 11)
Students will learn how to use adjunct structures such as exercises and journal keeping in advanced group leadership.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship (M: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10)
Work with individuals and groups to effectively lead groups and affect change in the counseling relationship.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis (M: 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11)
Acquire and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to work effectively with individuals experiencing a trauma or are in crisis. Students will demonstrate applied knowledge: a) crisis counseling relevant to the practice of counseling; b) recognizes the type of crisis counseling procedures and practices, and acquired knowledge of research literature regarding crisis counseling.
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others (M: 5, 8, 10, 12)

Process ethical dilemmas and lead others in supervision for successful resolution and toward the implementation of an intervention.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 4: Advocate for the profession (M: 1, 6, 11)

Advocate by demonstrating actions that will further the identity and respect for the counseling profession.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 5: Share knowledge with professional community (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11)

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

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 6: Implement advanced counseling skills (M: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9)

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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 7: Implementation of specific theories in practice (M: 8, 9)

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.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
2.1 Faculty
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Apply group theory through research (M: 8, 9, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will learn how to apply counseling theory to advanced group leadership. Students will learn about new research trends in advanced group leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (M: 8, 9, 10, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will learn about diversity issues in advanced leadership of personal growth group members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students fulfilled the residency requirements. The average for the students was 4.5 professional activities.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students fulfilled the residency requirements. The average for the students was 4.5 professional activities.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum rating of 3.0. The average for the students was 5.31.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum rating of 3.0. The average for the students was 5.31.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.8.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.8.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.8.

**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% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 94% on the learning assessment.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 94% on the learning assessment.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 94% on the learning assessment.

**M 5: 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 pass the on-line examination. The target performance is 75% correct. Students will 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will successfully pass the on-line examination. The target performance is 75% correct. Students will 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others**

90% of the students will successfully pass the on-line examination. The target performance is 75% correct. Students will 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will successfully pass the on-line examination. The target performance is 75% correct. Students will 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will successfully pass the on-line examination. The target performance is 75% correct. Students will 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**M 6: 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 meeting a minimum level 3.0 rating. The evaluation is based on a 1-5 scale (inadequate, needs revision, adequate, above average, excellent). **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum requirement of 3.0. The average for the students was 4.9

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**

90% of the students will be assessed for meeting a minimum level 3.0 rating. The evaluation is based on a 1-5 scale (inadequate, needs revision, adequate, above average, excellent). **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum requirement of 3.0. The average for the students was 4.9

**M 7: Involvement in a community and or profession activ (O: 1, 2, 6)**

Students will demonstrate through participation in activities related to community involvement through the Student Affiliate Organization (SAO) Sigma Iota or one of the departmental student organizations. This participation can be in local, state, and national organizations (community).

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

90% of the students will participate in research, conference presentation, community outreach, and assist in the administration of conferences. The student is evaluated through completion of one of the activities each year. 90% of the students will demonstrate behaviors reflecting the implementation of community involvement. **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in one of the community activities. 75% of the membership participated in sponsoring and volunteering services at the annual LPCA Convention in St. Mountain.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

90% of the students will participate in research, conference presentation, community outreach, and assist in the administration of conferences. The student is evaluated through completion of one of the activities each year. 90% of the students will demonstrate behaviors reflecting the implementation of community involvement. **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in one of the community activities. 75% of the membership participated in sponsoring and volunteering services at the annual LPCA Convention in St. Mountain.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

90% of the students will participate in research, conference presentation, community outreach, and assist in the administration of conferences. The student is evaluated through completion of one of the activities each year. 90% of the students will demonstrate behaviors reflecting the implementation of community involvement. **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in one of the community activities. 75% of the membership participated in sponsoring and volunteering services at the annual LPCA Convention in St. Mountain.
### M 8: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA (O: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Training and application of ethical guidelines pertinent to the establishment, conducting, and group outcome for various types of groups are acquired.

#### Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O7: Implementation of specific theories in practice

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O8: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, & APA

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O9: Apply group theory through research

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O10: Co-leader functions

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

#### Target for O11: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.
**Target for O12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

Assessment of student learning outcome is evaluated through use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. Minimal performance requirement is 3.5 or greater on a 1-5 measure. The total score is 55 and the average for satisfaction is 38 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**
Students averaged 4.4 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**M 9: Apply group theory through research (O: 2, 6, 7, 9, 12)**

Group theory assists in noting the size of effective group work, curative variables, and membership roles. Research is to aid in the selection of appropriate theoretical application for various issues brought to counseling.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

Assessment is determined through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. This measure is rated on a scale of 1-5. Target performance is 3.5 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.0 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O6: Implement advanced counseling skills**

Assessment is determined through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. This measure is rated on a scale of 1-5. Target performance is 3.5 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.0 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O7: Implementation of specific theories in practice**

Assessment is determined through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. This measure is rated on a scale of 1-5. Target performance is 3.5 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.0 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O9: Apply group theory through research**

Assessment is determined through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. This measure is rated on a scale of 1-5. Target performance is 3.5 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.0 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

Assessment is determined through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. This measure is rated on a scale of 1-5. Target performance is 3.5 or greater.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.0 on the 5.0 scale.

**M 10: Co-leader functions (O: 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12)**

Co-leadership functions pertains to the standard level in didactic learning and in the application component. The advantages and disadvantages in co-leadership training is central to effective group functioning and outcome.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship**

Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**Target for O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others**

Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.
**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**Target for O8: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, & APA**
Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**Target for O10: Co-leader functions**
Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**Target for O12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**
Assessment in co-leadership functions is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 rating scale.

**M 11: Acquired knowledge and use of adjunct structures (O: 2, 4, 5, 11)**
Adjunct structure is to acquire learning in the utilization of different group formations, intervening in community actions and needs and community resources for this development.

**Target for O2: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**
Assessment for acquired knowledge and use of adjunct structures is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O4: Advocate for the profession**
Assessment for acquired knowledge and use of adjunct structures is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O5: Share knowledge with professional community**
Assessment for acquired knowledge and use of adjunct structures is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 scale.

**Target for O11: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures**
Assessment for acquired knowledge and use of adjunct structures is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.9 on the 5.0 scale.

**M 12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (O: 3, 8, 9, 12)**
Sensitivity in group learning in diversity is to acquire and respect differences in communication (verbal and non-verbal), values, mores, and the world view of all clients.

**Target for O3: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others**
Assessment for sensitivity and group learning in diversity is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Student averaged 4.5 on a 5.0 rating scale.
Target for **O8: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, & APA**
Assessment for sensitivity and group learning in diversity is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Student averaged 4.5 on a 5.0 rating scale.

Target for **O9: Apply group theory through research**
Assessment for sensitivity and group learning in diversity is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Student averaged 4.5 on a 5.0 rating scale.

Target for **O12: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**
Assessment for sensitivity and group learning in diversity is assessed through the use of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory. The target performance is 3.5 or greater on a rating scale of 1-5

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Student averaged 4.5 on a 5.0 rating scale.

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

**Add an additional outcome measure**
The faculty will maintain the present outcome measure but add a second measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Residency participation in profession | Outcome/Objective: Advocate for the profession
  - Measure: 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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: CPS 8650 Individual Response Paper | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
  - Measure: Process ethical dilemmas & lead others | Share knowledge with professional community

- **Implementation Description:** April, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Greg Brack

**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 8450 | Outcome/Objective: Lead groups in the counseling relationship

- **Implementation Description:** May, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Jonathan Orr, CPS faculty is the responsible for designing and implementing the instrument.

**Feedback regarding ethical responses**
Internship supervisors (gus and site) will provide behavioral responses to effective ethical responses to client care.
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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Form 1010 Supervisor’s evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Advocate for the profession
| 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

Maintain and monitor
Maintain and monitor

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CPS 8650 Individual Response Paper | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
| Lead groups in the counseling relationship | Share knowledge with professional community
Measure: CPS 8450 | Outcome/Objective: Lead groups in the counseling relationship
| Share knowledge with professional community | Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis
Measure: Project for clinical relevance to crises | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
| Share knowledge with professional community
Measure: Residency participation in profession | Outcome/Objective: Advocate for the profession
| Share knowledge with professional community
| Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis
Measure: Involvement in a community and or profession activ | Outcome/Objective: Implement advanced counseling skills
| Lead groups in the counseling relationship | Process ethical dilemmas & lead others | Share knowledge with professional community | Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis
Measure: Residency participation in profession | Outcome/Objective: Advocate for the profession
| Share knowledge with professional community

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Because several of the objectives are intertwined with each other cooperation in isolating specific objectives were outlined for each objective. The result was a clearer response rate for skill acquisition and implementation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Monitoring of CPS faculty reports and site supervisor cooperation in conducting skill acquisition and clinical application of skills.

Mission / Purpose
Based on our commitment to diversity, advocacy and the belief that change is possible, the mission of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services is to prepare competent professionals in rehabilitation counseling to contribute to the body of knowledge that undergirds these professions and to provide service to the profession and the community.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 12, 16, 18)
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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling (M: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 17, 18)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Complete an entry level program of training (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Counsel with other educational professionals (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Effectively works with groups of clients (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18)

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)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: Practices educational, social & career assessment (M: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15)

Students will acquire skills to understand and implement career assessment behaviors as a counselor.

**Relevant Associations:** Council for Accrediting Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

### Strategic Plan Associations

**6.3 Graduate Experience**

#### O/O 0: 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, 18)

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)
### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding through written and/or oral expression of their professional identity as a professional counselor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: Effectively works with groups of clients.</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional skills as they work individually and with groups of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional behaviors as they serve and function in counseling and consulting with diverse population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: Practices educational, social, &amp; career assessment</strong></td>
<td>Students will acquire skills to understand and implement career assessment behaviors as a counselor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</strong></td>
<td>Students will gain an understanding of professional expertise through conducting and facilitating program evaluation and research efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate the acquisition of the knowledge for the principles and problem solving methods to practice the ethical code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 7: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.</strong></td>
<td>Students will gain an understanding and will practice an application of appropriate use of technology to assist clients through educational, social, and career assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1015: Written and Oral external (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)</td>
<td>- Target: Met</td>
<td>Forty-four returned evaluations of 67 interns external averaged 4.54 and 4.43 respectively for written and oral effectiveness during 2007-2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Counsel with other educational professionals</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-four returned evaluations of 67 interns external averaged 4.54 and 4.43 respectively for written and oral effectiveness during 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-four returned evaluations of 67 interns external averaged 4.54 and 4.43 respectively for written and oral effectiveness during 2007-2008.

**M 2: For 1015 Overall Evaluation (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**
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 O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: 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 on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: counsel with other educational professionals**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Practices educational, social & career assessment**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forty-three of the interns averaged an overall mean of 4.52 exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**

The CPS Comprehensive Examination has 12 subtests assessing the overall knowledge in the core courses for the M.S. degree.

**Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: counsel with other educational professionals**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**Target for O0: Practices educational, social & career assessment**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.
**Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS Comprehensive Examination. Sixty-six students took the comprehensive examination during 2007-2008. Sixty-two passed on first attempt for a 90% pass rate. Upon re-examination 100% passed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
90% of the GSU students successfully passed the comprehensive examination the first time (72 of 80). Upon second examination a semester later all 80 were successful.

**M 4: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**
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 O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: counsel with other educational professionals**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Practices educational, social & career assessment**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

**Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the professional ethics portion of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Seventy-two of 80 students successfully passed (90%) the ethics subtest for the departmental examination for 2007-2008.

### M 5: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 0, 0, 0)
The National Counselors Examination (NCE), an external evaluation has 1 subtest of 8 assessing research knowledge.

#### Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students (n=78) will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review. 100% of the students will attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for a national group, CACREP programs and non-CACREP program.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students averaged 10.91 on the subtest research and program evaluation. When compared to national sample mean (8.5), CACREP mean (9.98) and non-CACREP mean (9.83) GSU students all comparison groups.

#### Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
90% of the students (n=78) will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review. 100% of the students will attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for a national group, CACREP programs and non-CACREP program.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students averaged 10.91 on the subtest research and program evaluation. When compared to national sample mean (8.5), CACREP mean (9.98) and non-CACREP mean (9.83) GSU students all comparison groups.

#### Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students (n=78) will achieve 72% of the items correct on the end of year external review. 100% of the students will attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for a national group, CACREP programs and non-CACREP program.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students averaged 10.91 on the subtest research and program evaluation. When compared to national sample mean (8.5), CACREP mean (9.98) and non-CACREP mean (9.83) GSU students all comparison groups.

### M 6: Comprehensive Examination subtest (O: 0, 0, 0, 0)
Appraisal subtest on the 150 departmental examination contains 12 questions relative to appraisal in vocational, educational, psychological assessment.

#### Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination. (n=80)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Eighty students took the 2008 comprehensive examination and 100% passed with an average of 83% on appraisal.

#### Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination. (n=80)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Eighty students took the 2008 comprehensive examination and 100% passed with an average of 83% on appraisal.

#### Target for O0: Practices educational, social & career assessment
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS Departmental examination. (n=80)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Eighty students took the 2008 comprehensive examination and 100% passed with an average of 83% on appraisal.

#### Target for O0: 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. (n=80)

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Eighty students took the 2008 comprehensive examination and 100% passed with an average of 83% on appraisal.

### M 7: Form 1015 Clinical Reasoning (O: 0, 0, 0, 0)
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 O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Practices educational, social &amp; career assessment</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 0, 0, 0)**
The CPS Departmental Examination has one subtest measuring research knowledge. The research subtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% of the examinees scored 75% on the research and evaluation sub-test of the departmental examination for 2007-2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% of the examinees scored 75% on the research and evaluation sub-test of the departmental examination for 2007-2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% of the examinees scored 75% on the research and evaluation sub-test of the departmental examination for 2007-2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Form 1015 Cumulative end of Year Evaluation Scale (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**
Form 1015 Scale 4: Assessment is evaluated for each student on a 1-5 scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</strong></th>
<th>95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>2008, 44 of 67 returned evaluations reported an external 4.49 average of exceeding the 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations</strong></th>
<th>95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>2008, 44 of 67 returned evaluations reported an external 4.49 average of exceeding the 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></th>
<th>90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Forty-four of sixty-seven (67) intern evaluations were returned in 2008 and averaged 4.53 on clinical reasoning exceeding the goal of 3.0 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
2008, 44 of 67 returned evaluations reported an external 4.49 average of exceeding the 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008, 44 of 67 returned evaluations reported an external 4.49 average of exceeding the 3.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O0: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

### Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients
95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

### Target for O0: Practices educational, social & career assessment
95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

### Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
95% of the students to attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

### M 10: Departmental Comprehensive Examination (O: 0, 0, 0, 0)
The CPS departmental examination (150 items) has one subscale (12 items) assessing knowledge of developmental information.

### Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training
90% of the students will score 72% of the subscale items correctly on developmental knowledge.

### Target for O0: 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.

### M 11: CPS 7680 Form 1015 (1-5 scale) for effective ethic (O: 0, 0, 0)
Students will be rated by on-site supervisors for effective application of ethics in client care.

### Target for O0: 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.

For 2008, 44 of 67 student returned evaluations reported external evaluations with an average of 4.63 exceeding 3.5.
| **Target for O0: 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 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | For 2008, 44 of 67 student returned evaluations reported external evaluations with an average of 4.63 exceeding 3.5. |

| **Target for O0: 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 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | For 2008, 44 of 67 student returned evaluations reported external evaluations with an average of 4.63 exceeding 3.5. |

| **M 12: Internship membership in American Counseling Assoc (O: 0, 0, 0)** | All students entering practicum/internship (second year) become members in the American Counseling Association (ACA) demonstrating an advocacy for the profession |

| **Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor** | 90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA. |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 100% (n = 67) of the interns were qualified members of ACA in 2007-2008. n=67 |

| **Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training** | 90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA. |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 100% (n = 67) of the interns were qualified members of ACA in 2007-2008. n=67 |

| **Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics** | 90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA. |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 100% (n = 67) of the interns were qualified members of ACA in 2007-2008. n=67 |

| **M 13: Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for effectiveness (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)** | 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 O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling** | 90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. (n = 67) |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5. |

| **Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training** | 90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. (n = 67) |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5. |

| **Target for O0: counsel with other educational professionals** | 90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. (n = 67) |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5. |

| **Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients** | 90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. (n = 67) |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5. |

| **Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics** | 90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. (n = 67) |
| **Findings 2007-2008** - **Target: Met** | 67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5. |
67 students during 2007-2008 averaged 5.1 on Form 1010. This average exceeded the target goal of 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: National Counselors Examination (O: 0, 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National Counselors Examination (external review) has 1 subtest of 8 devoted to ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, ethics. 100% of the students will attain a mean score equal to or greater than a national, CACREP programs and non-CACREP program comparison groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventy-eight (100%) examinees attained a mean score of 24.18 compared to 21.37 for a national average, mean of 23.14 for CACREP programs and a mean of 23.16 for non-CACREP programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: National Counselors Examination (O: 0, 0, 0, 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National Counselors Examination (NCE) is a 200 item examination based on content from 8 core courses. The developmental subtest of the NCE has 17 questions representing developmental knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Complete an entry level program of training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve 72% or greater on the NCE subtest, ethics. 100% of the students will attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for a national group, CACREP programs and non-CACREP program comparison groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventy-eight (100%) examinees attained a mean score of 24.18 compared to 21.37 for a national average, mean of 23.14 for CACREP programs and a mean of 23.16 for non-CACREP programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: CPS 7260 acquire knowledge specific to application (O: 0, 0, 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Comprehensive Examination (one subtest of 12) measuring theory, strategies, application, and outcome for individual and family communication and treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students taking the comprehensive examination will pass this subtest of the comprehensive with a 70% pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students passed the sub-test on the comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
90% of the students taking the comprehensive examination will pass this subtest of the comprehensive with a 70% pass.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students passed the sub-test on the comprehensive examination.

**Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients**
90% of the students taking the comprehensive examination will pass this subtest of the comprehensive with a 70% pass.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students passed the sub-test on the comprehensive examination.

**Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students taking the comprehensive examination will pass this subtest of the comprehensive with a 70% pass.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students passed the sub-test on the comprehensive examination.

**M 17: CPS 7260 acquire knowledge specific to application (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**
An external review is conducted across a national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample taking the National Counselor Examination. Human Relationships is one of eight measures. 90% of the students will average at or exceed the mean for the comparison groups. This submeasure has 43 questions of a 200 item examination.

**Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling**
GSU students will demonstrate a mean score that is equal or exceeds three comparison groups. The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE during April.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
GSU students demonstrated a mean score of 27.66 compared to 22.78 for a national sample, 26.27 mean for CACREP program students and 26.17 mean for non-CACREP program students.

**Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations**
GSU students will demonstrate a mean score that is equal or exceeds three comparison groups. The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE during April.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
GSU students demonstrated a mean score of 27.66 compared to 22.78 for a national sample, 26.27 mean for CACREP program students and 26.17 mean for non-CACREP program students.

**Target for O0: Counsel with other educational professionals**
GSU students will demonstrate a mean score that is equal or exceeds three comparison groups. The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE during April.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
GSU students demonstrated a mean score of 27.66 compared to 22.78 for a national sample, 26.27 mean for CACREP program students and 26.17 mean for non-CACREP program students.

**Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients**
GSU students will demonstrate a mean score that is equal or exceeds three comparison groups. The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE during April.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
GSU students demonstrated a mean score of 27.66 compared to 22.78 for a national sample, 26.27 mean for CACREP program students and 26.17 mean for non-CACREP program students.

**Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
GSU students will demonstrate a mean score that is equal or exceeds three comparison groups. The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE during April.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
GSU students demonstrated a mean score of 27.66 compared to 22.78 for a national sample, 26.27 mean for CACREP program students and 26.17 mean for non-CACREP program students.

**M 18: CPS 7260 external review for theory, strategies- (O: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)**
The sub-test human relation on the National Counselor Examination measures knowledge and skill application in communication, theory, strategies, techniques and ethics regarding individual and family practice.
### Target for O0: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

### Target for O0: Applies appropriate technology for counseling

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

### Target for O0: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

### Target for O0: Counsel with other educational professionals

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

### Target for O0: Effectively works with groups of clients

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

### Target for O0: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

GSU students will exceed the mean of three external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) measure acquired knowledge and application skills. The mean is set by the combined students taking the examination.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the 78 students taking the external NCE scored a mean of 27.66 and when compared to the national sample mean (22.78), CACREP mean (26.27) and non-CACREP mean (26.17) the target goal was met. (n = 78)

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

A second major strength in student evaluations did not highlight any weaknesses (variances) rather strengths based on external reviewers (site supervisors). Form 1015 with 10 evaluations showed an average range of 4.43 to 4.64. This range reflected a narrow range of variance across the critical skills demonstrated in counseling.

Counseling course preparation is applied in the setting in which students are counseling. These two measures emphasized acquired knowledge, technological understanding, and applied knowledge.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The overall external review by site supervisors reflected a minimal drop in averages across the 10 subtests on Form 1015 although...
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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: Goal IVa - Contemporary Issues (M: 1)
Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context provided by psychology.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 2: Goal IVb - Global/Multicultural/International (M: 2)
Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions in the context of current psychological principles.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: PSYC1101 Mastery Text for Goal IVa (O: 1)
The assessment questions considered for the Goal IVa analysis were embedded in a 50-question, pencil-and-paper mastery test that was administered to students in multiple sections of PSYC 1101 at the end of the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 terms (see questions below). All of the questions on the mastery exam were multiple-choice with four or five options. For this goal, we measured the percent of students correctly answering several questions related to this goal (1, 14, 31, 48) for each of 10 sections of this course. Questions: 1) Individuals who are normally law-abiding may vandalize and loot when they become part of a mob. This change in behavior is best understood in terms of: a) social facilitation. b) the mere exposure effect. c) in-group bias. d) the bystander effect e) deindividuation 14) After an extended period as a prisoner of war in an enemy camp, soldiers who experience particularly brutal treatment are likely to become apathetic, stop eating, and give up all efforts to physically survive the ordeal. This reaction most clearly illustrates: a) an inferiority complex. b) learned helplessness. c) repression. d) an internal locus of control. e) reaction formation. 31) In a test of the effects of cigarette smoking on physical health and development, groups of monkeys were raised in either a smoke-free or smoke infested environment. Monkeys in the smoke-infested environment were exposed to the condition. a) correlational b) control c) survey d) experimental 48) Prior to the invasion of Iraq, the U.S. government claimed that the Iraqi government was actively preparing weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) for use against its enemies. The evidence upon which the claim was made was later shown to be largely incorrect. Moreover, several investigations revealed that the U.S. government ignored other information suggesting there were no WMDs in Iraq. Psychologists refer to the tendency to look for evidence that supports one’s beliefs as: a) confirmation bias. b) framing. c) functional fixedness. d) the representativeness heuristic.

Target for O1: Goal IVa - Contemporary Issues
Our target performance level was a median percent correct of 70% or better across all sections for these questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Four of 10 sections measured answered these questions with 70% correct or better. The lowest scoring section had an average score of 52.5% correct. The highest scoring section had an average of 84.75% correct. The median percent correct across all sections for these questions was 66.7%.

M 2: PSYC1101 Mastery Text for Goal IVb (O: 2)
The assessment questions considered for the Goal IVb measurement were embedded in the same mastery test described above (Goal IVa). The median percent correct was calculated for questions related to this goal (#2, 3, 15, 20 and 35) for each of 10 sections of this course Questions: 2) Six-year-old Roberto believes that boys are better than girls, while 5-year-old Meisha believes that girls are better than boys. Their beliefs most clearly illustrate: a) the reciprocity norm. b) in-group bias. c) the fundamental attribution error. d) deindividuation e) the mere exposure effect 3) Over the past 50 years, women in the U.S. have expressed...
satisfaction with their physical appearance and have experienced a(n) ______ incidence of serious eating disorders. a) increasing; decreasing b) decreasing; decreasing c) increasing; increasing d) decreasing; increasing 15) Which research method would be most appropriate for investigating the relationship between the religious beliefs of Americans and their attitudes toward legalizing marriage for homosexual couples: a) a survey b) a case study c) naturalistic observation d) an experiment 20) When shown photographs of facial expressions of basic emotions, people from 21 different countries: a) were able to accurately identify each of the emotions being expressed. b) were only able to accurately identify the facial expressions from fear and disgust c) were able to accurately identify happiness, guilt, and disgust, but not anger and fear. d) varied greatly in their ability to correctly identify the different emotions being expressed. 35) Evolutionary psychology would be most helpful for understanding the ______ human aggression. a) social causes of b) reproductive advantages of c) cross-cultural variations in d) remedial treatments of

Target for O2: Goal IVb - Global/Multicultural/International

The target performance level for this goal was a median of 70% correct or better across all sections for these questions.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

3 of the 10 sections scored 70% or better on these questions. The lowest scoring section had an average of 64.6% correct across all questions. The highest scoring section had an average of 75.4% correct. The median percent correct score across all sections was 75.8.

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

Correlate mastery test and class performance.

To evaluate mastery test questions, we plan on correlating mastery test performance with performance in the course overall. This will provide an index of discrimination and increase the validity of the questions relevant to our objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PSYC1101 Mastery Test for Goal IVa | Outcome/Objective: Goal IVa - Contemporary Issues
Measure: PSYC1101 Mastery Test for Goal IVb | Outcome/Objective: Goal IVb - Global/Multicultural/International

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Deborah Garfin, Chris Goode

Review mastery test questions

As both learning objectives are concerned with applying discipline-specific analysis to contemporary issues, it is important to maintain the questions on the mastery test which apply to these objectives. We will reconsider all questions on an annual basis and create new questions to better measure students’ ability to apply psychological principles to current issues.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PSYC1101 Mastery Test for Goal IVa | Outcome/Objective: Goal IVa - Contemporary Issues
Measure: PSYC1101 Mastery Test for Goal IVb | Outcome/Objective: Goal IVb - Global/Multicultural/International

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Deborah Garfin, Chris Goode

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 report that nearly all sections were close to meeting our target level goals for both objectives. Nearly all sections (8/10) had an average of 60% or better for our measurement related to objective 1 (Goal IVa). All sections had an average of 63% or better for our measurement related to objective 2 (Goal IVb). Four of 10 sections met our target level goal for objective 1 and 3 of 10 sections met our target level goal for objective 2.

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

We continue to strive for our goal of 70% correct in each section, and we plan on addressing this by revisiting our measurement for this (Fall 2008) semester. Since our objectives involve applying psychological principles to contemporary issues, it is important to monitor our questions to reflect current events. To evaluate new questions, we plan on correlating percent correct with overall performance in the course (see action plan below).
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**
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 2, 5, 6)**

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**
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
**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**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**6.2 Undergraduate Experience**

**SLO 6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods (M: 2, 5, 6)**

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
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**

4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**6.2 Undergraduate Experience**

**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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Contemporary Issues - Core**

70% correct on each question in each section

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

- For 9 of the 12 sections of this course, the percentage of correct answers was calculated for each question. Across these 9 sections, the median percent correct scores ranged from 62-85%. The average percent correct scores ranged from 61-81%. Across all sections, and questions, the median percent correct score was 72.5%. Further analysis revealed that not every section produced 70% correct on every question. Overall, only 28 of the 50 questions (56%), on average, were answered correctly at by 70% of the class or greater. However, we found that 35 of the 50 questions (70%), on average, were answered correctly by at least 70% of every section.

**M 2: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest (O: 3, 6)**

10 computational and short-answer questions.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills**

75% correct on post-test and significant improvement from pre-test. The Pre- and Post-tests included the same 10 computational and short answer questions. The Departmental learning goals specified 75% correct on the post-test and significant improvement from the pre-test.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

- Analysis of 96 students’ pre- and post-test scores revealed significant improvement after the course, t(95)=19.001, p<0.001. The size of this effect was exceptionally large, d=1.94. On average, students answered only 69.2% of the post-test questions correctly (SD = 2.12); only 46% of students answered more than 75% correctly and 60% of students answered more than 70% correctly. However, the median percent correct was 70%, approaching our goal.
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 classes. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Analysis of 93 students’ data revealed significant improvement in writing quality from baseline (mean=6.82, SD=1.68) to the final paper (mean=7.67, SD=1.77), t(92)=5.68, p<0.001. The size of this effect was medium (Cohen’s d=0.59). The scores for discipline specific (APA style) writing improved significantly as well, from baseline (mean=4.76, SD=3.09) to the final paper (mean=6.55, SD=2.18), t(93)=10.71, p<0.001. The size of this effect was quite large (Cohen’s d=1.11).

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Analysis of 93 students’ data revealed significant improvement in writing quality from baseline (mean=6.82, SD=1.68) to the final paper (mean=7.67, SD=1.77), t(92)=5.68, p<0.001. The size of this effect was medium (Cohen’s d=0.59). The scores for discipline specific (APA style) writing improved significantly as well, from baseline (mean=4.76, SD=3.09) to the final paper (mean=6.55, SD=2.18), t(93)=10.71, p<0.001. The size of this effect was quite large (Cohen’s d=1.11).

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Analysis of 93 students’ data revealed significant improvement in writing quality from baseline (mean=6.82, SD=1.68) to the final paper (mean=7.67, SD=1.77), t(92)=5.68, p<0.001. The size of this effect was medium (Cohen’s d=0.59). The scores for discipline specific (APA style) writing improved significantly as well, from baseline (mean=4.76, SD=3.09) to the final paper (mean=6.55, SD=2.18), t(93)=10.71, p<0.001. The size of this effect was quite large (Cohen’s d=1.11).

M 6: Psyc 4760 Research Practicum Evaluation form (O: 1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 11)

This form is used by faculty and field supervisors to evaluate student performance using a 5-point scale from 1=poor and 5=excellent on Objectives: 1,2,3,4, and 5. Objective 10 is a survey of student evaluations of career planning and development on a 5-point Likert scale from poor to excellent. This survey is limited to the degree that a particular practicum experience is able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student's satisfaction with that experience.

Target for O1: Career Planning and Development

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.

Target for O2: Communication and Collaboration Skills

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.

Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.

Target for O6: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.

Target for O10: Information and Technology Literacy

80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O11: Values in Psychology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On average, 99.85% of students were rated as good (4) or better across all ratings; 13.82% (SD = 12.21) received a score of Good (4) and 86.03% (SD = 12.14) received a score of Excellent (5). The average rating across all categories was 4.88.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Psych 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form (O: 1, 5, 7, 9)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This form is used by faculty and field supervisors to evaluate student performance using a 5-point scale from 1=poor and 5=excellent on Objectives 6, 7, 8, and 9. Objective 10 is a survey of student evaluations of career planning and development on a 5-point Likert scale from poor to excellent. This survey is limited to the degree that a particular practicum experience is able to offer all of the items on the survey and the student’s satisfaction with that experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Career Planning and Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averaging across all objectives, 94% of students received a rating of Good (4) or better; 32% (SD = 22.72) received a rating of Good (4) and 61% received a rating of Excellent (SD = 25.22). The average rating across all objectives was 4.53.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Theory and Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averaging across all objectives, 94% of students received a rating of Good (4) or better; 32% (SD = 22.72) received a rating of Good (4) and 61% received a rating of Excellent (SD = 25.22). The average rating across all objectives was 4.53.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averaging across all objectives, 94% of students received a rating of Good (4) or better; 32% (SD = 22.72) received a rating of Good (4) and 61% received a rating of Excellent (SD = 25.22). The average rating across all objectives was 4.53.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averaging across all objectives, 94% of students received a rating of Good (4) or better; 32% (SD = 22.72) received a rating of Good (4) and 61% received a rating of Excellent (SD = 25.22). The average rating across all objectives was 4.53.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Re-evaluate Learning Outcomes**
Ensure that initial characterization of learning outcomes is still acceptable by faculty.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** November 1, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Program Committee

**Refine Assessment Procedures - Core**
For the 2006-2007 assessment, faculty involved in PSYC 1101 instruction will revise the mastery test to remove or reword any questions that may be specifically linked to the presentation of material in a particular textbook. In addition, we will revise or replace questions that were missed by 50% or more of the students in either of the previous two assessment years. For the purposes of the Core Curriculum Area E assessment, this revision will include a particular focus on developing more accessible questions to address the portion of the core requirement related to the analysis of multicultural, global, and international issues.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues - Core
- **Implementation Description:** November 30, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PSYC 1101 Course Coordinator and PSYC 1101 faculty

**Refine Assessment Procedures - Major**
We plan to continue to refine our assessment instruments and procedures.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
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 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.

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 text book 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.

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.

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 chose 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.

Educate field and research supervisors on LOs.

Educate field and research supervisors on the learning outcomes important to 4760 and 4770.

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 text book 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.

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.

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 chose 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.

Educate field and research supervisors on LOs.

Educate field and research supervisors on the learning outcomes important to 4760 and 4770.
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 4760 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 Psyc1101 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues - Core

Implementation Description: Fall semester, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: 1101 Course coordinator

Implement peer tutoring program for statistics.

The peer tutoring program (see analysis) was proposed to improve learning and retention of students, which we hope will lead to improved post-test scores. Briefly, undergraduates who have demonstrated excellence in PSYC3010 will be recommended by instructors to serve as peer tutors in later semesters, and undergraduates who need extra help will be able to meet with them as needed. This program has been approved and funded, and will go into effect in Fall, 2008.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Posttest | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
| Research Methods: Understand & apply methods

Implementation Description: Fall, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Henrich, Kim Darnell, Chris Goode

Initiate new Statistics/Research Methods sequence.

The Psychology Department has redesigned our core statistics/research methods sequence with the specific objectives of research methods (objective 2) and critical thinking (objective 5) in mind. The new courses represent a more comprehensive and integrative approach to teaching scientific research methods in the discipline and the application and understanding of their appropriate statistics. As the course content from the existing PSYC3010/3030 sequence will be redistributed over these two new courses, we will have to refine our measurements for these courses.
Refine PSYC1101 Measure
We will continue to refine the PSYC1101 Mastery Test, our only measure of objective 11, contemporary issues, which is our core measure. We will update questions on a yearly basis to better reflect current events. We will also conduct an item-by-item analysis of the 50 question test and eliminate questions which do not meet the following criteria: fewer than 70% of students answer correctly AND discrimination index of less than 0.40. This would indicate that answering the question correctly does not predict good overall performance on the measure.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Discipline specific writing and critical analysis | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
| Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
Measure: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
| Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
Implementation Description: Fall, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kim Darnell, Chris Goode

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Department of Psychology has made excellent progress this year toward achieving its learning outcomes in the major and the core. In particular, we are pleased to report that we exceeded our target levels for our measures for PSYC4760 and 4770, the Research and Applied Practica. As these measures are related to 9 of our 11 learning objectives (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10), the findings are quite encouraging. The effort that went into improving the assessment procedures for these courses over the past year was clearly fruitful. We also exceeded our target levels for two of our measures in PSYC3110, Interpersonal Psychology. These measures, which were also both refined this year, are related to objectives 2 and 6. We are pleased to report meeting our target levels of significant improvement for our discipline-specific writing and critical analysis measure, related to objectives 2, 4 and 5. The size of the improvement effect on discipline-specific writing in particular was remarkably large. We partially met our target levels for our measure in PSYC1101, Introductory Psychology, our only measure of objective 11, and we showed improvement on this measure from the previous year. Finally, we partially met our target levels for our measure of PSYC3010, Psychological Statistics. This measure showed significant improvement in research methods and critical thinking skills (objectives 2 and 5), with an extremely large effect size, and we came quite close to meeting our other target level with a median percent correct of 70%.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We failed to fully meet target levels for the measures generated by two courses: PSYC1101, our sole measure for objective 11, contemporary issues, and PSYC3010, which applies to objectives 2 and 5. Although some sections of PSYC1101 exceeded the target level for our measure, not every section reached this goal. Our findings for our 3010 pretest-posttest measure showed that although there was significant improvement overall, which a large effect size, the average score was slightly below our target performance level. We have developed action plans that address the shortcomings in both of these measures. As the PSYC1101 Mastery Test is our only measure for our core objective, we plan on investing significant effort in validating and refining this assessment. Specifically, we will conduct an item-by-item analysis of each question which currently appears on the test, and reject items which meet both the following criteria: fewer than 70% of students answer the question correctly AND a discrimination index of less than 0.40. This would indicate that answering the question correctly does not predict a good score on the test overall. The PSYC3010 pretest-posttest measure assesses two learning objectives: Understanding Research Methods (objective 2) and Critical Thinking Skills (objective 5). Although we met our target for significant improvement in this measure, the median score was only 70%, short of our target of 75%. Our action plan for this measure involves two important changes in our statistics and research methods courses. The first is a program of peer tutoring in statistics. Briefly, undergraduates who have demonstrated excellence in PSYC3010 will be recommended by instructors to serve as peer tutors in later semesters, and undergraduates who need extra help will be able to meet with them as needed. This program has been approved and funded, and will go into effect in Fall, 2008. Second, the Psychology Department is in the process of restructuring our core courses of PSYC3010/3030 to build a more comprehensive, integrative statistics/research methods sequence. The new courses will begin in Fall, 2009. As this new sequence (PSYC3510/3530) is geared toward meeting these two objectives, we expect our measures for these objectives to show improvement. Finally, this year's findings indicate a systematic review of our goals and measures is in order. We plan to make our target goals and methods of analysis more consistent across our different measures.
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, Cognitive Sciences, Development Psychology, and Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience. Our graduate students seek 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Theory and Content (M: 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Research Methods (M: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and work in groups effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Application (M: 6, 7, 8, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply psychological principles in professional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 6, 7, 8, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show insight into one's own and other's behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire skills in accessing and disseminating information with the use of computer technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13)
Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.

Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

---

### SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 5, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)
Incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international issues in their work.

Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

---

### SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (M: 6, 7, 8, 12)
Emerge from graduate school with credentials and plans for career path.

Relevant Associations: Relevant for American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: PhD Dissertation (proposal) (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 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 67% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008** - Target: Met
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
85% of 7-year or higher students have their PhD proposal accepted.

**M 2: PhD Dissertation (defense) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**M 3: 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 O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed expertise with data analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
70% earned a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed expertise with data analysis

**M 4: Performance in ethics course (O: 8)**
Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% earned a grade of B or higher on a major in-class presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Performance in diversity courses (O: 9)**

Psyc 8050 or Psyc 8060: Diversity issues in clinical practice and psychological research, or Issues of human diversity in psychology

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed expertise with issues of human diversity.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% earned a grade of B or higher on a major research paper on diversity.

**M 6: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**
Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All 7 students exceeded expectations.

**M 7: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)**
Review of course evaluations.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**Target for O4: Application**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
17% of GTA evaluations had a score of less than 4 on Question #17.

**M 8: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Faculty members of each program review all students in their program annually to determine how many students are performing satisfactorily on each learning outcome.

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

**Target for O4: Application**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.
**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

---

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

---

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

---

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
6% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in one or more of the objective areas.

---

**M 9: Thesis (proposal) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Graduate thesis proposal

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 67% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92.31% of 3-year or higher students, who have not completed their MA, have their MA proposal accepted.

---

**M 10: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**M 11: 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 on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% earned a grade of B or higher on their final paper.

**M 12: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10)**
Publications and presentations

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more students.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more students.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O4: Application**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Our faculty published an average of 1.18 publications and 4 presentations co-authored by one or more more students.

**M 13: General Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8)**

Scored by committee of faculty

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

91% passed on first attempt

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

91% passed on first attempt

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

90% passed on first attempt

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>91% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>91% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</th>
<th>90% passed on first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>91% passed on first attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 14: MA proposal evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the oral presentation of the Master’s proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) for Learning Outcome 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Theory and Content</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Research Methods</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.48 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 15: PhD proposal evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the oral presentation of the PhD proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) for Learning Outcome 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Theory and Content</th>
<th>The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Target for O2: Research Methods
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.

## Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.

## Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.

## Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.

## Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.58 or higher.

### M 16: MA Defense evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)
During the oral presentation of the Master’s defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) for Learning Outcome 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

## Target for O1: Theory and Content
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.

## Target for O2: Research Methods
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.

## Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.

## Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.

## Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.
Target for **O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.53 or higher.

**M 17: PhD defense evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**
During the oral presentation of the PhD defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) for Learning Outcome 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

Target for **O1: Theory and Content**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

Target for **O2: Research Methods**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

Target for **O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

Target for **O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.24 or higher.

**M 18: General Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**
During the oral defense of the General Exam, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations) for Learning Outcome 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

Target for **O1: Theory and Content**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

Target for **O2: Research Methods**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average rating for each outcome was 2.09 or higher.

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

#### MA proposal guidelines
To decrease the number of 3 year or greater students who have not completed their MA proposal, programs will be encouraged to make review of this milestone a regular agenda item during their program meetings throughout the semester, rather than waiting for annual evaluation letters as the single point for review.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty members

#### PhD proposal
Too many 7 year or greater students have not completed their PhD proposal; goal barely met.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** PhD Dissertation (proposal) | **Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills
  - **Critical Thinking Skills** | **Information and Technology Literacy** | **Research Methods** | **Theory and Content** | **Values in Psychology**

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty members

#### 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Teaching performance | **Outcome/Objective:** Application
  - **Career Planning and Development** | **Communication and Collaboration Skills** | **Personal Development**

- **Measure:** Teaching training | **Outcome/Objective:** Application
  - **Career Planning and Development** | **Communication and Collaboration Skills** | **Personal Development**

- **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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** PhD Dissertation (defense) | **Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills
  - **Critical Thinking Skills** | **Information and Technology Literacy** | **Research Methods** | **Theory and Content** | **Values in Psychology**
  - **Critical Thinking Skills** | **Information and Technology Literacy** | **Research Methods** | **Theory and Content** | **Values in Psychology**
**Thesis (defense) | Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills  
| Critical Thinking Skills | Information and Technology Literacy | Research Methods | Theory and Content | Values in Psychology  
**Thesis (proposal) | Outcome/Objective:** Communication and Collaboration Skills  
| Critical Thinking Skills | Information and Technology Literacy | Research Methods | Theory and Content | Values in Psychology

**Implementation Description:** Spring 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Medium  
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and all faculty members

### Track Master’s thesis defense performance

To develop a more detailed system for tracking performance in the Master’s Thesis defense. 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Medium  
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and all faculty members

### Track PhD defense performance

To develop a more detailed system for tracking performance in the PhD defense. 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Medium  
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and all faculty members

### Track student publications/presentations

Collect data that will allow us to determine how many individual students publish and present.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Medium  
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2007  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program

### Improve data analysis skills

Determine why target performance was not met for the data analysis measure #7 and identify possible interventions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
**Improve personal development**
Determine why several students(6) did not perform satisfactorily on the Personal Development Objective and identify possible interventions.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
*Implementation Status*: Planned  
*Priority*: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Annual evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development

*Implementation Description*: August 1, 2009  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Graduate Program Committee

**Improve teaching performance**
Assist students with poor teaching evaluations by having faculty observe the student’s teaching and work with the student to develop an individualized intervention.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
*Implementation Status*: Planned  
*Priority*: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Application  
| Communication and Collaboration Skills | Personal Development

*Implementation Description*: August 1, 2009  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Faculty supervisor for teaching seminar Psyc 9900T

**Increase diversity training**
Currently, only a subset of students who work with humans (as opposed to non-human animals) are required to take a Diversity course. Explore the possibility of making a Diversity class a requirement for all students working with humans.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
*Implementation Status*: Planned  
*Priority*: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Performance in diversity courses | Outcome/Objective: Sociocultural and International Awareness

*Implementation Description*: August 1, 2009  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Graduate Program Committee

**Track publications and presentations**
Collect data that will allow us to determine how many individual students publish and present.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
*Implementation Status*: Planned  
*Priority*: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Application  
| Career Planning and Development | Communication and Collaboration Skills | Critical Thinking Skills | Information and Technology Literacy | Personal Development | Research Methods | Theory and Content

*Implementation Description*: August 1, 2009  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Graduate Program Committee

**Track student awards and career placement.**
Track how many fellowships and awards students receive and how many go on to obtain employment or further training in their field.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
*Implementation Status*: Planned  
*Priority*: Low

*Implementation Description*: August 1, 2009  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Graduate Program Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

In response to the feedback received on the 2006-7 Assessment Report, the full description of Learning outcome #9 (Demonstrate awareness of sociocultural and international issues) was rephrased in order to be more intentional and precise. In addition, measures in which course grades were used previously were revised to use performance on major assignments that assessed the objectives more directly. One measure was deleted due to lack of precision (grades in required courses). Five new measures were added that are more sensitive to the learning outcomes (measures #15 - 18). Specifically, we now collect data that assesses how the student performed in relation to the outcomes on the Master's thesis proposal and defense, PhD proposal and defense, and General Exam. Overall, the 2007-8 assessment shows that target performance was met or exceeded on most of the measures. In response to Action plans #1, 3, and 4 from the 2006-7 report, we have become more rigorous in tracking performance in the General Exam, Master's
thesis defense, and PhD defense, respectively. Previously, the Graduate Program only noted the date in which a student passed a milestone, but did not keep systematic records regarding failed attempts. Now, students are required to inform the Graduate Program of General Exam, proposal or defense dates. The Graduate Program can then contact the student and advisor to determine the outcome. In addition, the Director of Graduate Studies also surveys the faculty once per year regarding the number of students who have taken the Exam or participated in a proposal or defense and the outcome of each. Action plan #2 from the 2006-7 report was to promote timely progress. In response to this, the Director of Graduate Studies encouraged Program Chairs to make review of milestones a regular agenda item during program meetings, rather than waiting for annual evaluation letters as the single point of review. In addition, the Director of Graduate Studies now provides Program Chairs in the spring with a list of students that will be at risk of probation or dismissal in the fall, which is when the Graduate Program Committee reviews student progress. This provides students with the summer period to make progress on their milestones. This may account for the finding that for Measure #2, the number of 3-year or higher students who had their Master’s proposal accepted increased from 47% in 2005-6, 60% in 2006-7, to 92.31% in 2007-8. Similarly, the number of 7-year or higher students who have had their PhD proposal accepted increased from 70% in 2005-6, 75% in 2006-7 to 85% in 2007-8 (Measure #4).

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

Action plan #5 from the 2006-7 report was to standardize annual letters, because they did not have any uniform criteria and did not refer specifically to milestones and outcomes. The Graduate Program Committee decided that it would be extremely cumbersome to standardize letters across faculty and programs. Consequently, each program was asked to review each student annually in terms of whether or not the student performed satisfactorily on each outcome (Measure #12). Although the measure is now more precise, the performance target was not met. Analysis of the data indicated that 6 students demonstrated less than satisfactory performance on Objective 6: Personal Development. An action plan was developed in this report to begin to identify the nature of the problem and possible interventions. Action plan #6 from the 2006-7 report was to track student publications and presentations. Presently, we only track how many faculty publications and presentations have one or more student co-authors. The goal remains to track how many individual students publish and present. A similar goal is begin tracking how many fellowships and awards students receive and how many go on to obtain postdoctoral training or employment in their field. Action plan #7 from the 2006-7 report was to improve poor teaching evaluations. Although there are many criteria that can be used to define a poor student evaluation of teaching performance, for the sake of objectivity and simplicity, a poor evaluation was defined as a score of less than 4 on Question #17: “Overall how would you rate this teacher’s performance”. Performance on this measure has remained less than satisfactory across the 3 reporting years, with 17% of GTA evaluations having a score of less than 4 on Question 17 in 2007-8. The Graduate Program Committee developed a plan this year for assisting graduate student teachers with improving their teaching performance and it is hoped that this number will decrease by the next reporting period.
Identify and analyze health disparities and design appropriate, culturally competent prevention and intervention strategies.

**SLO 6: Apply Theory in Field Settings (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
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, policy development/program planning, communication, cultural competency, community dimension of practice, obasic public health sciences, financial planning and management, and leadership and systems thinking.

**SLO 7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.

**SLO 8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Demonstrate skills in public health research and communication.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions**
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation**
60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 percent of all courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will successfully complete their practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Each MPH student has the option of completing either a thesis or a special capstone research project. Both culminating experiences are designed to test the student’s competency in core public health knowledge, skills and abilities and to ensure proficiency in the student’s area of specialization. Students are expected to present their thesis or capstone project in writing and defend it orally, to a faculty committee. Performance evaluation will consider the number and quality of thesis and capstone projects during each academic year. Evaluation will be based on the student’s demonstration of overall achievement of learning outcomes as evidenced by the work in the culminating experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Assess Public Health Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities
All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

### Target for O6: Apply Theory in Field Settings
All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

### Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

### Target for O8: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills
All students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

#### M 5: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Following completion of the degree program, information about program outcomes will be sought from the new graduate. The survey gauges usage of learning outcomes in an applied public health setting, career changes or advancement, further advanced study, and activities such as publication or peer-reviewed presentations that confirm learning outcomes. Performance evaluation will be based on graduate participation in the survey, response to survey questions, self-assessment of skill and application in the core competencies, and impact of graduate education experience on career and academic development.

### Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts
75 percent of students will complete an alumni survey, and 50% of respondents will report that being employed in a public health setting.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
#### Evaluate Health Research Methods Course
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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Successful Completion of Core Courses | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills | Demonstrate Planning, Implementation & Evaluation
**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: Critical Thinking Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Theory in Field Settings | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Communication and Research Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Planning, Implementation & Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Core Public Health Concepts | 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: Critical Thinking Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Theory in Field Settings | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Communication and Research Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Planning, Implementation & Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Understand an Ecologic Approach to Public Health | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities
- Measure: Core Public Health Concepts | 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: Planning, Implementation & Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Core Public Health Concepts | Outcome/Objective: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: Core Public Health Concepts | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Health Disparities

**Implementation Description:** Spring 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 is 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) and will be required of all students starting with those admitted in Fall 2006.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
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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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Understand Responsibilities as Citizens (M: 2, 3, 4)
Students demonstrate an understanding of their responsibilities as citizens in a democratic society.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Understand scientific methods applied to policy (M: 12, 13, 14)
Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to policy issues.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 3: Define link between ethics, politics, and theory (M: 11, 13, 14)

Students will be able to define the link between ethics, politics, and theory in social research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Demonstrate ability to use research methods (M: 11, 12, 14)

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to use observational techniques in experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, unobtrusive research, and evaluation research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Demonstrate ability to write research proposal. (M: 11, 12, 13)

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to write a research proposal.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Basic concepts measures and data sets (M: 16, 17)

Students will become familiar with basic concepts measures and data sets.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Apply statistical techniques for analysis (M: 15, 17)

Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 8: Use of computer to perform statistical analysis (M: 15, 16)

Students will develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Quantitative Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 2.21 | Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.2 | Undergraduate Experience |

#### SLO 9: Market economy and application of theory to policy (M: 19, 20)

Students will learn about market economy and the application of theories to current policy issues.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 5 | Contemporary Issues |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 2.21 | Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.2 | Undergraduate Experience |

#### SLO 10: Legal and political framework of market (M: 18, 20)

Students will learn the legal and political framework that underlies the market economy.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 5 | Contemporary Issues |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 2.21 | Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.2 | Undergraduate Experience |

#### SLO 11: Basic tools of government intervention (M: 18, 19)

Students will be able to 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.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 5 | Contemporary Issues |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 2.21 | Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.2 | Undergraduate Experience |

#### SLO 12: How to Shape Public Policy (M: 1, 3, 4)

Students understand the variety of ways they can help shape public policy.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 | Written Communication |
| 2 | Oral Communication |
| 4 | Critical Thinking |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 1.13 | Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline |
| 2.21 | Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences |

### Strategic Plan Associations

| 6.2 | Undergraduate Experience |

#### SLO 13: Explore Roles as Citizens (M: 1, 2, 4)

Students explore the role of active citizens within the community.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 | Written Communication |
| 2 | Oral Communication |
| 4 | Critical Thinking |

### Institutional Priority Associations

| 3.31 | Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students |

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 14: Participate in public affairs (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students participate in public and community affairs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Collaboration
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### SLO 15: Meet leaders from different backgrounds. (M: 6, 7)
Students will meet leaders from a variety of backgrounds and learn how they led change in their organizations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### SLO 16: Explore theoretical perspectives on leadership. (M: 5, 7)
Students will explore theoretical perspectives on leadership.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking

### SLO 17: Practical applications to leadership. (M: 5, 6)
Students will compare theoretical approaches to leadership with practical applications.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### SLO 18: Understand Policy Process (M: 9, 10)
Students will demonstrate understanding of the major steps in the public policy process.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

### SLO 19: Apply Policy Process to Current Policy (M: 8, 10)
Students will apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### SLO 20: Critical thinking about Process (M: 8, 9)
Students will exhibit critical thinking about the policy process and policy outcomes

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: understand responsibilities of citizens (O: 12, 13, 14)
Students demonstrate an understanding of their responsibilities as citizens in a democratic society.

**Target for O12: How to Shape Public Policy**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 97% of students fully demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**Target for O13: Explore Roles as Citizens**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students fully demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

Target for O14: Participate in public affairs
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students fully demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

M 2: How to Shape Public Policy (O: 1, 13, 14)
Students understand the variety of ways they can help shape public policy.

Target for O1: Understand Responsibilities as Citizens
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

Target for O13: Explore Roles as Citizens
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

Target for O14: Participate in public affairs
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

M 3: Explore Roles as Citizens (O: 1, 12, 14)
Students explore the role of active citizens within the community.

Target for O1: Understand Responsibilities as Citizens
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

Target for O12: How to Shape Public Policy
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

Target for O14: Participate in public affairs
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.
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**Target for O12: How to Shape Public Policy**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**Target for O13: Explore Roles as Citizens**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 97% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**M 5: Meet leaders from different backgrounds. (O: 16, 17)**
Students will meet leaders from a variety of backgrounds and learn how they led change in their organizations.

**Target for O16: Explore theoretical perspectives on leadership.**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**Target for O17: Practical applications to leadership.**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.
students at least partially demonstrated the skill.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**M 7: Practical applications to leadership. (O: 15, 16)**
Students will compare theoretical approaches to leadership with practical applications.

**Target for O15: Meet leaders from different backgrounds.**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**Target for O16: Explore theoretical perspectives on leadership.**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in weekly writing assignments.

**M 8: Understand Policy Process (O: 19, 20)**
Students will demonstrate understanding of the major steps in the public policy process.

**Target for O19: Apply Policy Process to current policy**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 94% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O20: Critical thinking about 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 94% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**M 9: Apply Policy Process to Current Policy (O: 18, 20)**
Students will apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy.

**Target for O18: Understand 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O20: Critical thinking about 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**M 10: Critical thinking about process (O: 18, 19)**
Students will exhibit critical thinking about the policy process and policy outcomes

**Target for O18: Understand 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 94% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O19: Apply Policy Process to Current Policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 94% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**M 11: Understand scientific methods applied to policy (O: 3, 4, 5)**

Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to policy issues.

**Target for O3: Define link between ethics, politics, and theory**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 96.8% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate ability to use 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 96.8% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**M 12: Define link between ethics, politics, and theory (O: 2, 4, 5)**

Students will be able to define the link between ethics, politics, and theory in social research.

**Target for O2: Understand scientific methods applied to policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate ability to use 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate ability to write research proposal.**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 93% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Demonstrate ability to use research methods (O: 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to use observational techniques in experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, unobtrusive research, and evaluation research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understand scientific methods applied to policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O3: Define link between ethics, politics, and theory**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O5: Demonstrate ability to write research proposal.**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Demonstrate ability to write research proposal. (O: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to write a research proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Understand scientific methods applied to policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O3: Define link between ethics, politics, and theory**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate ability to use 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 92% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Basic concepts measures and data sets (O: 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will become familiar with basic concepts measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Apply statistical techniques for analysis**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 90% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.
### Target for O8: Use of computer to perform statistical analysis
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 90% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 16: Apply statistical techniques for analysis (O: 6, 8)
Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

### Target for O6: Basic concepts measures and data sets
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 86% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Use of computer to perform statistical analysis
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 86% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 17: Use of computer to perform statistical analysis (O: 6, 7)
Students will develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

### Target for O6: Basic concepts measures and data sets
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 88.4% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O7: Apply statistical techniques for analysis
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 88.4% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 18: Market economy and application of theory to policy (O: 10, 11)
Students will learn about market economy and the application of theories to current policy issues.

### Target for O10: Legal and political framework of market
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O11: Basic tools of government intervention
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 19: Legal and political framework of market (O: 9, 11)
Students will learn the legal and political framework that underlies the market economy.

**Target for O9: Market economy and application of theory to policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O11: Basic tools of government intervention**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**M 20: Basic tools of government intervention (O: 9, 10)**

Students will be able to 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 O9: Market economy and application of theory to policy**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

**Target for O10: Legal and political framework of market**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Overall, 91% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions and as described in writing assignments.

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

**Revision of two-course methods sequence**

Department is revising the two-course methods sequence (currently PAUS 4121 and 4131).

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Apply statistical techniques for analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Basic concepts measures and data sets
- **Measure:** Use of computer to perform statistical analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply statistical techniques for analysis
  - Basic concepts measures and data sets

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dept Chair and BSPP Committee

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

For the 2007 - 2008 academic year, 91.63% of the 392 BSPuP students at least partially demonstrated with 62.87% fully demonstrating the program's core course objectives.

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

There are two measures that require continued attention (16 and 17). These are related to continuing concern over the two-course methods sequence. A committee is meeting to revise this sequence with changes in place by fall 2009.
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 frameworks (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Analytical Methods of Public Policy (O: 1)
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.

Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks
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.

M 2: Field of Specialization (O: 1)
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks
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.

M 3: Original Research in Public Policy 1 (O: 1)
Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks
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.

M 4: Original Research in Public Policy 2 (O: 1)
Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks
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.

M 5: Original Research in Public Policy - 3 (O: 1)
Students will apply their understanding of the theories and methods of public policy to a particular sub-field to produce original research.

Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks
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.

M 6: Comprehensive examination (O: 1)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core comprehensive examination.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of theoretical frameworks**

90% of students will pass this section of the comprehensive exam.

---

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

**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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction (M: 2)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (SBRR principles).

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading & Writing (M: 1)**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing (M: 3)**

Candidates integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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.
**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2007-2008</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Faculty Rating - Content Knowledge -Rdng/Wrtng (O: 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge -Reading &amp; Writing</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>92% of the program completers achieved the target performance for this standard according to the STARS data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Faculty Rating- Research-based Reading Instruction (O: 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Demonstrates Research-based Reading Instruction</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>85% of the program completers achieved the target performance for this standard according to the STARS data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments (O: 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Creates Literate Environments for Rdg and Writing</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>96% of the program completers achieved the target performance for this standard according to the STARS data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Faculty Rating - Professional Behaviors/Activities (O: 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Develops Professional Behaviors and Activities</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>92% of program completers achieved the target performance for this standard according to the STARS data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5: Faculty Rating - Assessment To Plan Instruction (O: 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Uses Assessment To Plan Effective Instruction</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
87% of program completers achieved the target performance for this standard according to the STARS data.

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

Increase Attention to Writing Instruction
Faculty will examine coursework within the RLL M.Ed program to consider where attention to writing theories and instruction could be strengthened.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- 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 - Rdng/Wrtn | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
- Measure: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates Literate Environment 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 - Rdng/Wrtn | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing
- Measure: Faculty Rating - Creates Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates Literate Environment 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

Students will include more information about effective writing instruction in their portfolio assessment.

- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating - Content Knowledge - Rdng/Wrtn | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Knowledge - Reading & Writing

- Responsible Person/Group: RLL M.Ed faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments for this program need to be more clearly linked. All students in this program passed the GACE certification requirement, demonstrating their thorough understanding of literacy and effective pedagogy.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The focus this year will be to incorporate the required portfolio narratives into the appropriate course that addresses that standard.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

---

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: 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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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.
### Strategic Plan Associations

**1.13** Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**1.15** Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

**2.23** Educational support systems that foster student access and success

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 1 (O: 1)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field.
setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
83.33% of the candidates "demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge"

M 2: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 2 (O: 2)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O2: Understands student development re: learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of the candidates demonstrate an "understanding of student development re: learning"

M 3: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 3 (O: 3)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of the candidates “can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.”

M 4: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 4 (O: 4)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
76.67% of the candidates "know and use multiple instructional strategies."

M 5: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 5 (O: 5)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O5: Can motivate and manage students for learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of the candidates "can motivate and manage students for learning."

M 6: Faculty STARS Rating 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
96.67% of the candidates "use communication skills and technology"
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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
83.33% of candidates "can effectively plan for instruction."

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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
70% of the candidates "understand and use assessment for learning."

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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
93.33% of students "practice personal reflection."

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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at "involving school and community in learning."

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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 1 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 10 | Outcome/Objective: Involves school and community in learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 2 | Outcome/Objective: Understands development re: learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 3 | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 4 | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning
- Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 6 | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Students in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL program performed well on all performance assessments. 2005-2006 was the second year of this program and the cohort numbers were very small. The 2006-2007 cohort is triple in size and 2 new faculty and 1 new supervisor have joined the program. The primary focus for this year will be to ensure all faculty understand the program design and content and are able to maintain the quality of the program with the increased size of our cohort.

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

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

Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL Faculty and Supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Yan Wang and Eudes Aoulou

Increase Communication and Collaboration
The growth of the program has required that faculty and supervisors maintain and further increase communication and collaboration regarding program design, courses, and placements. This is especially true with regards to the cooperating teachers at the local school level. The supervisors met with the cooperating teachers prior to the placements to provide an overview of the program and address any questions and/or concerns. An advisory group of cooperating teachers has been formed and met during the Georgia Read Write Now conference to share insights regarding the program design, course work and placements.

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

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

Implementation Description: 2007-08 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL faculty and supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker-Sachs, Yan Wang and Terry Fisher

Increased Focus on Assessment
Candidates in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL Program performed moderately well on “Understanding and using assessment for learning.” Evidence for demonstrating this standard was revealed in their electronic student teaching notebooks, supervisor observations and portfolio standards. To that end the TEEMS faculty will more systematically address issues of authentic assessment, rubric creation, and how assignment drives instruction. The faculty will do this in courses and in student teaching seminars.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty STARS Rating on Standard 8 | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: 2008-2009 School year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL faculty and supervisors: Gertrude Tinker-Sachs, Amy Flint, Teresa Fisher.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In response to the identified areas of need in the 2006-2007 report, faculty met with cooperating teachers on multiple occasions in order to open lines of communication and to get feedback upon the work that has been done with students. A stronger effort to get feedback from all graduates of the program also reinforced the quality of feedback for the development of our program. The TEEMS RLL-ESOL program continues to develop due to faculty emphasis on collaboration and communication. This increased coherence and collaboration across courses is strengthening our program significantly. This increased engagement of all stakeholders reflects our dedication to improving our program.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
From 2006-2007 year to 2007-2008 year there has been a drop in the area of “Understanding and using assessment for learning.” A concerted effort will be made by faculty to provide multiple opportunities to focus on issues of assessment across the courses in the 2008-2009 academic year.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: To develop creative decision-making skills (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: To develop business communication skills (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to communicate real estate decisions and recommendations effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Assignments in the real estate investment course. (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the real estate investment course (Numerical grade).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
82% average. 18 of 23 students taking the course met target expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2: Assignments in the finance and mortgage course (O: 1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the finance and mortgage banking course. (Numerical Grade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
78.5% average. Out of 53 students, 17 failed to meet the target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3: Assignments in the real estate development course. (O: 1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the real estate development course. (Numerical Grade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
88.94 and all students exceeded the target.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

71%. Only 11 out of 23 students met the criteria. We had two cases of plagiarism on the writing assignments and two students who did not turn in all assignments, so average dropped. We also tried grading the drafts this time to encourage more effort, but it did not work well.

**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:** Finished
- **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**

We have an instructor who graded higher than we would normally expect. Chair has addressed this issue with the instructor and will monitor progress.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **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:** 8/15/07
  **Responsible Person/Group:** 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:** Finished
- **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 faculty
  **Additional Resources:** None

**Grading too high in development.**

Even when we change instructors in this course, grading remains higher than expected. We shall endeavor to keep emphasizing high standards to instructors.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  
  **Measure:** Assignments in the real estate development course. | **Outcome/Objective:** To develop creative decision-making skills

  **Implementation Description:** August 2008
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair

**Improve number of students that meet the targets.**

We have about 30% of the students that fail to meet the targets in Finance, investments and writing. We continue to work on those issues.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
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 investment course. | Outcome/Objective: To develop creative decision-making skills
Measure: Performance on writing assignments | Outcome/Objective: To develop business communication skills

Implementation Description: August 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Department chair and instructors.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Overall, we continue to be generally satisfied with the results

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We continue to have a problem with evaluation in development
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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

M 1: Investment assignments in the capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on investment assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
8.21 Average. 19 took test. 13 exceeded the target, 6 failed to meet the target.

M 2: Financing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on real estate financing assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
M 3: Marketing assignments in capstone course (O: 1)
Performance on real estate marketing assignments in the case study capstone course.

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
8.57% average. 14 students took the test and 11 scored above the target level.

M 4: Leadership performance on NAIOP competition (O: 2)
Leadership skills observed by faculty advisor in NAIOP competition.

Target for O2: To develop real estate business leadership skills.
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
9.0 Average. At various times, all students exhibited strong leadership.

M 5: Teamwork among the various member of NAIOP team (O: 3)
Students should all be contributing members to team as observed by the faculty advisor.

Target for O3: To become contributing members of effective team.
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
10.00 average. Outstanding teamwork particularly when facing deadlines.

M 6: Ability to provide functional expertise to team. (O: 3)
Students should be able to provide functional expertise to the NAIOP team as observed by the faculty advisor.

Target for O3: To become contributing members of effective team.
7.5

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
9.5 average - Students did a great job in terms of their functional expertise.

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 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

Improve percentage of students that meet target
We have 30% of our students fail to meet targets. This needs to be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Financing assignments in capstone course | Outcome/Objective: To develop creative decision-making skills
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: August 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Department chair and instructors for RE 8020,8030 and 8060.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
This year we had a larger sample to draw from in our tests. Overall we are happy with students’ performance.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
About 30% of our students lack some type of functional skills in marketing finance and investments. We must focus more attention on those areas.
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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: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate competence in applying the foundations of rehabilitation counseling to their field work, including knowledge of its history, professional identity, the rehabilitation practice setting, medical and psychological aspects of disabilities, barriers and enhancements to case management and job placement, and ethical and legal considerations.

Relevant Associations:
Council on Rehabilitation Education

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

\[\text{Measures, Targets, and Findings}\]

\[\text{M 1: Certification tests and major exams (O: 1)}\]
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

\[\text{Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence}\]
a) At least 90% pass rate on national certification exam b) Of questionnaire respondents, the program will be rated good or higher (3.0 on scale of 1 to 5). c) Of supervisors responding, 85% rate the program as good or higher d) at least 85% pass rate e) Continued accreditation by CORE (Council on Rehabilitation Education f) APACE reviewers positive review of program

\[\text{Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met}\]
a) Over the past year, 100% of students who took the CRC exam passed (compared to 73% nationally). Items b), c), d) e) were accomplished through an on-site re-accreditation visit by CORE. The program received an exceptionally complimentary report. There were no deficiencies, weakness or recommendations identified.

\[\text{M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 2)}\]
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

\[\text{Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice}\]
Evaluation of performance by instructors through the assessment of rehab potential project, term papers, and direct observation of performance in helping skills classes, group counseling class, and by supervisors in the practicum/internship classes.

\[\text{Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met}\]
All students were rated as adequate or better. One student required a corrective plan of action which was successfully achieved prior to the end of the semester.

\[\text{M 3: Evaluation of work with people with disabilities (O: 3)}\]
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.

\[\text{Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities}\]
Achieving passing scores (160 out of 200) or evaluations by supervisors.

\[\text{Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met}\]
All students enrolled in relevant classes achieved the goals.

\[\text{M 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (O: 4)}\]
Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.

\[\text{Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse population}\]
(a) Successfully completing the assessment of rehabilitation potential by achieving at least 160 out of 200 points. (b) student knowledge of the 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%.

\[\text{Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met}\]
(a) All students achieved the required score, although one student was required to provide additional work which was
accomplished by the time grades were submitted. (b) All students achieved the desired goals. (c) All students achieved the
goal although one student required remedial work which was accomplished prior to her date of graduation. (d) Over the past
year, 100% of students who took the CRC exam successfully passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counsel and consult with diverse populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel and consult with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Annually or as required within various classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Faculty who teach internships and courses relating to helping skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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                                                 |
| 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                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Annual or as required within various classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Faculty who teach ethics related courses and internships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Evaluation of work with people with disabilities</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Work with clients with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Annual general review; periodic review as required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Various faculty who teach internships and helping skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed, Joe Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Demonstrate effective counseling/consultation                 |
| Assess student’s effective counseling/consultation with people with disabilities |
| Established in Cycle: 2006-2007                                 |
| Implementation Status: Planned                                 |
| Priority: Low                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Counsel and consult with diverse populations</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Counsel and consult with diverse population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: April 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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): |
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
Implementation Description: Fall through spring semester
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed
Additional Resources: Student assistants and site visit financing

Continued accreditation
The program will continue to monitor the progress achieved through the re-accreditation process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed, Joe Hil

Reviews of student competence with clients
The coordinator of the program will contact faculty supervisors to obtain an assessment of student competence and ethical practice with clients

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Spring semester 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The on-site reaccredidation review by the Council on Rehabilitation Education revealed excellent results. As noted previously, the preliminary report indicated no deficiencies, no weaknesses, and no recommendations were offered.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
No changes are needed. It appears that the program is meeting all reasonable objectives.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Religious Studies BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of religions. Universities are one of the few venues in which such education about religion (rather than “religious education”) currently takes place. Given this fact, it is perhaps not surprising that Religious Studies has enjoyed incredible national growth since September 11th. Time Magazine (9/11/2002), the Atlanta Journal Constitution (8/6/2002) the Associated Press (9/11/2002), and the London Times (9/6/2002) each recently reported on this phenomenon. But it is important to note that the field has been growing for decades, with new degrees (either graduate or undergraduate) in Religious Studies being established during the last twenty years at such schools (to use the Southeast as an example) as the University of Georgia, Florida State University, Florida International, Duke, and UNC-Greensboro. Georgia State's diverse student body and emphasis on international and multi-cultural education makes its Religious Studies Program absolutely essential to its larger projects. When the College of Arts and Sciences organized a lecture series in the aftermath of September 11th, Religious Studies provided as many speakers as any other program in the University. When CNN broadcast one of its first reports on the brand of Islam that may have inspired the September 11th attacks, it was a Georgia State Religious Studies faculty member who appeared live on prime time to explain the issues. Although it might be an overstatement to say that University projects like the new programs in Middle East Studies,
Jewish Studies, and Asian Studies would not exist without Religious Studies participation, it is safe to say that these programs would be far weaker. Religious Studies is an integral part of the intellectual life of this University.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: General Religious History (M: 1, 3, 5)

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>5 Contemporary Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 2: Specific Religious Traditions (M: 1, 3, 5)

Ability to synthesize detailed knowledge of specific religious traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>5 Contemporary Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 3: Major Religious Thinkers (M: 1, 3, 5)

Ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>4 Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 4: Major Theorists (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of major theorists in the study of religion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>4 Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 5: Theory and Method (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to understand, assess, and employ critical theories in the study of religion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>4 Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SLO 6: Scholarly Categories (M: 1, 3, 4)

Ability to understand and apply basic scholarly categories in religious studies.

| Institutional Priority Associations             | 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs |
|                                                | 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation |
|                                                | 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation |

#### SLO 7: Comparative Approach (M: 1, 3, 4, 5)

Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to specific themes.

<p>| Institutional Priority Associations             | 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs |
|                                                | 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation |
|                                                | 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 8: Religion and Culture (M: 1, 3, 5)**

Ability to recognize and explain the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 9: Historical Applications of Religion (M: 1, 3, 5)**

Ability to comprehend the ways that people in different cultures develop and apply religious resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 10: Reading Critically (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Ability to read critically and with comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 11: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Ability to think critically and write persuasively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 12: Applying Logical Principles (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Ability to apply principles of logic to the religious studies discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 13: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Student Surveys (Narrative) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**

Graduating Majors are solicited to identify particular strengths of the program and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

**Target for O1: General Religious History**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O4: Major Theorists**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O5: Theory and Method**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O6: Scholarly Categories**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O7: Comparative Approach**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O8: Religion and Culture**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O10: Reading Critically**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O11: Critical Thought and Expression**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O12: Applying Logical Principles**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**Target for O13: Conducting Research**

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

As in the previous years, students were unanimous in their praise of the Department. They most frequently mentioned the high quality of instruction, the opportunities to explore traditions and cultures other than their own, and the importance of learning about religion in its historical contexts. They also voiced hopes that the number of faculty and course offerings would increase.

**M 2: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) (O: 10, 11, 12, 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 technical skills.

**Target for O10: Reading Critically**

75% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

94% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 92% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 82% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B+ or
### Target for O11: Critical Thought and Expression

75% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

94% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 92% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 82% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 47% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A- or higher. 31% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A.

### 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.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

94% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 92% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 82% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 47% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A- or higher. 31% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A.

### Target for O13: Conducting Research

75% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for skills of student papers ranking B+ or higher.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

94% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B- or higher. 92% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B or higher. 82% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 47% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A- or higher. 31% of faculty evaluations for technical skills of student papers ranked A.

### M 3: 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.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.75 or higher. No students ranked the Department below average for any of the articulated goals.

#### Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions

90% of student rankings on individual learning goals scoring 4.00 or higher. 75% of mean student rankings on individual goals scoring 4.50 or higher.

#### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

critically: 4.75.Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Major Theorists</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Theory and Method</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Scholarly Categories</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Comparative Approach</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Religion and Culture</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion</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>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The mean scores of student evaluations: Understanding nature/varieties of religion: 4.88. Familiarity with major theorists/thinkers: 4.75. Understanding theory/method in the field: 4.88. Ability to compare traditions thematically: 4.88. Familiarity with diverse religious phenomena: 4.75. Ability to read/comprehend texts critically: 4.75. Ability to think and write critically: 4.75. Ability to conduct research: 4.38. By way of synthesis, 97% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 4 or higher. 78% of student rankings on individual learning goals scored 5. 88% of mean student rankings on individual goals scored 4.50 or higher. 88% 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.

M 4: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Theoretical) (O: 4, 5, 6, 7, 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 theoretical content, i.e., knowledge of critical theory in the study of religion, scholarly categories, comparative method, etc.

Target for O4: Major Theorists
75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers
Target for O5: Theory and Method

75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O6: Scholarly Categories

75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O7: Comparative Approach

75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O10: Reading Critically

75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

Target for O13: Conducting Research

75% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 69% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 36% of faculty evaluations for theoretical content of student papers ranked A- or higher.

M 5: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Historical) (O: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 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 historical content, i.e., knowledge of religious history, religion in its social and cultural contexts, comparative data, etc.

Target for O1: General Religious History

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

Target for O2: Specific Religious Traditions

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty
evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**Target for O3: Major Religious Thinkers**

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**Target for O7: Comparative Approach**

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**Target for O8: Religion and Culture**

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**Target for O9: Historical Applications of Religion**

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**Target for O13: Conducting Research**

75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B- or higher. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking B+ or higher.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B- or higher. 97% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B or higher. 81% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked B+ or higher. 42% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A- or higher. 22% of faculty evaluations for historical content of student papers ranked A.

**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: Student Surveys (Narrative)
- Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical)
- Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
- Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Outcome/Objective: General Religious History
- Outcome/Objective: Historical Applications of Religion
- Outcome/Objective: Major Religious Thinkers
- Outcome/Objective: Major Theorists
- Outcome/Objective: Religion and Culture
- Outcome/Objective: Scholarly Categories
- Outcome/Objective: Specific Religious Traditions
- Outcome/Objective: 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 (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: Student Surveys (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Specific Religious Traditions
  Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | 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 (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thought and Expression | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Major Theorists | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method
  Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research | Critical Thought and Expression | Reading Critically | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method

Implementation Description: March 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

Master Calendar
The Department will develop a Master Calendar, so faculty and students will have sufficient time to plan and participate in public lectures, workshops, student symposiums, and so forth.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student Surveys (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Major Theorists | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method
  Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Major Theorists | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method

Implementation Description: 11/1/08
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond
Monitoring CTW Courses
Monitoring the development and execution of the new or newly configured CTW courses, with respect to the stipulated objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Historical) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
  | Historical Applications of Religion | Major Religious Thinkers
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Theoretical) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
  | Major Theorists | Reading Critically | Scholarly Categories | Theory and Method
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Applying Logical Principles
  | Conducting Research | Critical Thought and Expression | Reading Critically

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Herman

Oral Expression Assessment
The Assessment Committee will consider ways that oral communication can be assessed specifically.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Surveys (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Applying Logical Principles
  | Critical Thought and Expression
- Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Applying Logical Principles
  | Critical Thought and Expression

Implementation Description: May 15, 2010
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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Historical) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Specific Religious Traditions
- Measure: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Measure: Student Surveys (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method
- Measure: Student Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
  | Conducting Research | General Religious History | Historical Applications of Religion | Religion and Culture | Scholarly Categories | Specific Religious Traditions | Theory and Method

Implementation Description: Ongoing
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 targets for all articulated outcomes/objectives were met handily. Students demonstrated broad competence in various aspects of the theoretical study of religion, the historical and comparative study of religion, and critical thinking and expression.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
No single learning outcome or objective fell below the target goal, but scores for conducting research in religious studies were not as strong as those for other outcomes. There is now a plan in place to include a strong research component in the new or newly configured CTW courses.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Religious Studies, MA

(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, 4)**

Ability to understand the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture, to extrapolate a general working knowledge of at least four religious traditions and to synthesize a detailed knowledge of two traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 2: Theories of Religion (M: 1, 3)**

Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of at least three theorists or thinkers in the academic study of religion, and to demonstrate fluency in major terms and concepts in the field.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 3: Methodological Approaches to Religion (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 4: Comparative Approach (M: 1, 3, 4)**

Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to at least one specific theme.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 5: Reading Scholarly Texts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

The ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**SLO 6: Conducting Research (M: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

The ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies.
Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

SLO 7: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 2, 5)
The ability to construct clearly written arguments and commentary.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (Narrative) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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 produces written comments detailing the extent to which the thesis demonstrates mastery of historical, theoretical, methodological, and/or comparative aspects of the study of religion.

Target for O1: History of Religions
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

Target for O2: Theories of Religion
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

Target for O4: Comparative Approach
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

Target for O6: Conducting Research
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Clear faculty consensus that all theses demonstrated broad historical, theological, methodological, and/or comparative expertise.

M 2: Critical Thinking/Writing Evaluation of Thesis (O: 3, 5, 6, 7)
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 produces written comments
detailing the extent to which the thesis demonstrates the student’s ability to engage in critical thinking and writing in the academic
study of religion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% of theses were ranked B or higher. 36% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5: Reading Scholarly Texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% of theses were ranked B or higher. 36% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6: Conducting Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% of theses were ranked B or higher. 36% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7: Critical Thought and Expression</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79% of theses were ranked B or higher. 36% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 3: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 2, 3, 4, 5) |
| 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 theoretical content. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2: Theories of Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4: Comparative Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5: Reading Scholarly Texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 4: Historical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 1, 4, 5, 6) |
| 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 historical content. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1: History of Religions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of theses are ranked B or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of thesis were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O4: Comparative Approach
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.

Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.

Target for O6: Conducting Research
75% of theses are ranked B or higher.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of theses were ranked B or higher. 50% of theses were ranked A- or higher.

M 5: Critical Skills Evaluation of Theses (Narrative) (O: 3, 5, 6, 7)
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 produces written comments detailing the extent to which the thesis demonstrates the student’s abilities to engage in critical thinking, writing, and expression.

Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Strong consensus that theses demonstrate appropriate critical thinking and writing skills, although students’ abilities vary more widely in these skills than in content-oriented outcomes.

Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Strong consensus that theses demonstrate appropriate critical thinking and writing skills, although students’ abilities vary more widely in these skills than in content-oriented outcomes.

Target for O6: Conducting Research
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Strong consensus that theses demonstrate appropriate critical thinking and writing skills, although students’ abilities vary more widely in these skills than in content-oriented outcomes.

Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression
Consensus among faculty that articulated learning goals have been met satisfactorily.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Strong consensus that theses demonstrate appropriate critical thinking and writing skills, although students’ abilities vary more widely in these skills than in content-oriented outcomes.

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
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
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
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
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
Implementation Description: March 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

Critical Thinking and Writing
The Department faculty will discuss ways in which the development of critical thinking and writing skills can be addressed throughout the entire graduate program.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Skills Evaluation of Theses (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Critical Thought and Expression | Methodological Approaches to Religion
- Measure: Critical Thinking/Writing Evaluation of Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Critical Thought and Expression | Methodological Approaches to Religion

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

Narrative Evaluations
The Assessment Committee will consider ways that the narrative evaluation components can more directly address stipulated learning objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Comparative Approach
- Conducting Research | History of Religions | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts | Theories of Religion
- Measure: Critical Skills Evaluation of Theses (Narrative) | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Research
- Critical Thought and Expression | Methodological Approaches to Religion | Reading Scholarly Texts

Implementation Description: Ongoing
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?
In general, faculty assessments indicate that graduating Masters students demonstrate required levels of familiarity with the content knowledge and discipline skills of Religious Studies. Moreover, GSU Masters program graduates continue to be successful after completing their degrees. Students who graduated this year were admitted to top Ph.D programs at Boston University, Emory University, New York University, and University of California Santa Barbara.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
No single learning outcome or objective fell below the target goal, but students' abilities did vary widely on the critical thinking and writing components. Part of the current action plan is designed to address this specific issue.
### Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to prepare knowledgeable respiratory therapists and future leaders in the profession of respiratory care.

### 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
- 2 Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: 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**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 4: 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**
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: professional behaviors of advanced RT students (M: 8, 9, 10, 12)**
Students will exhibit professional behaviors as a member of the healthcare team.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: technical performance of advanced RT 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**

4 Critical Thinking
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 1. Case presentations (O: 1, 4)**
All students must successfully orally present a case study to the faculty and students at least once during the clinical seminar as part of their clinical practice rotation.

**Target for O1: communication skills both orally and in writing**
Case presentation scores will average 88% based on a standard rubric for the Division.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Thirty-two senior RT students during fall semester 2007 scored from 67 to 53 points for an average of 61 (87%) out of 70 possible points. During spring semester 2008, 46 first-year students scored from 67 to 59 out of possible 70 points for an average of 64 or 96%.

**Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care**
Case presentation scores will average 88% based on a standard rubric for the Division.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Thirty-two senior RT students during fall semester 2007 scored from 67 to 53 points for an average of 61 (87%) out of 70 possible points. During spring semester 2008, 46 first-year students scored from 67 to 59 out of possible 70 points for an average of 64 or 96%.

**M 2: NBRC Written Registry Exam (O: 2, 3, 4)**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Thirty seniors attempted the exam before graduation with 27/30 or 90% passing on the first attempt. To date, all 30 who have attempted the exam have passed. Percentages may change as 2 more students attempt to successfully pass this exam.

**Target for O3: use of technology**
Passing score as determined by the NBRC
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Thirty seniors attempted the exam before graduation with 27/30 or 90% passing on the first attempt. To date, all 30 who have attempted the exam have passed. Percentages may change as 2 more students attempt to successfully pass this exam.

### Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
passing score as determined by the NBRC

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Twenty-two of the 28 (79%) seniors who attempted this exam before graduation have passed on their first try. To date, 27/28 have successfully passed. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt this exam.

### M 3: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 2, 3, 4)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Twenty-two of the 28 (79%) seniors who attempted this exam before graduation have passed on their first try. To date, 27/28 have successfully passed. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt this exam.

### Target for O3: use of technology
passing score as determined by the NBRC

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Twenty-two of the 28 (79%) seniors who attempted this exam before graduation have passed on their first try. To date, 27/28 have successfully passed. Percentages may change as the remaining students attempt this exam.

### M 4: Departmental Exit Exam (O: 2, 3, 4)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All students passed with a 75% or greater 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 (n=3).

### Target for O3: use of technology
Score of 75% or greater

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All students passed with a 75% or greater 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 (n=3).

### Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
Score of 75% or greater

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All students passed with a 75% or greater 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 (n=3).

### M 5: Employer Survey-Psychomotor (O: 2, 4, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Fourteen (possible 39) surveys were completed via email and in person. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest. After tabulations, 35% of the employers rated the graduates with a score of 5, 38% with a score of 4, 25% with a score of 3 and 1% with a score of 2.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Fourteen (possible 39) surveys were completed via email and in person. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest. After tabulations, 35% of the employers rated the graduates with a score of 5, 38% with a score of 4, 25% with a score of 3 and 1% with a score of 2.

Target for O6: technical performance of advanced RT skills
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Fourteen (possible 39) surveys were completed via email and in person. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest. After tabulations, 35% of the employers rated the graduates with a score of 5, 38% with a score of 4, 25% with a score of 3 and 1% with a score of 2.

M 6: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor (O: 2, 4, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Five of a possible 39 surveys were returned for 13% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 4 on a 5 to 1 scale. 45% rated their skills as a 5, and 55% rated their skills as a 4.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Five of a possible 39 surveys were returned for 13% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 4 on a 5 to 1 scale. 45% rated their skills as a 5, and 55% rated their skills as a 4.

Target for O6: technical performance of advanced RT skills
For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Five of a possible 39 surveys were returned for 13% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 4 on a 5 to 1 scale. 45% rated their skills as a 5, and 55% rated their skills as a 4.

M 7: Summative Psychomotor Evaluation (O: 2, 4, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
31/32 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs.

Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
31/32 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs.

Target for O6: technical performance of advanced RT skills
Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
31/32 senior RT students achieved passing scores in their final clinical externship check-offs.
M 8: Employer Survey-Affective (O: 1, 4, 5)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Fourteen of 39 surveys were returned for 36% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 on a 1 to 5 scale. Of the surveys returned, 70% rated the graduate with a 5, 9% with a 4, 19% with a 3 and 2% with a 2.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Fourteen of 39 surveys were returned for 36% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 on a 1 to 5 scale. Of the surveys returned, 70% rated the graduate with a 5, 9% with a 4, 19% with a 3 and 2% with a 2.

Target for O5: professional behaviors of advanced RT students

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Fourteen of 39 surveys were returned for 36% response rate. Scores ranged from 5 to 2 on a 1 to 5 scale. Of the surveys returned, 70% rated the graduate with a 5, 9% with a 4, 19% with a 3 and 2% with a 2.

M 9: Graduate Survey-Affective (O: 1, 4, 5)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Four of possible 39 surveys returned. 78% rated their skill level as a 5 (on 5 to 1 scale with 5 being highest), and 22% rated their skill level as a 4.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Four of possible 39 surveys returned. 78% rated their skill level as a 5 (on 5 to 1 scale with 5 being highest), and 22% rated their skill level as a 4.

Target for O5: professional behaviors of advanced RT students

For each item, a score of >2 on a 1 to 5 scale is needed to indicate minimal acceptability.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Four of possible 39 surveys returned. 78% rated their skill level as a 5 (on 5 to 1 scale with 5 being highest), and 22% rated their skill level as a 4.

M 10: Summative Affective Evaluation (O: 5)

Each student must demonstrate adequate professional behavior as rated by an instructor prior to graduation.

Target for O5: professional behaviors of advanced RT students

Grading is Pass/Fail.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

All affective evaluations for seniors in RT 4052 during Spring semester 2008, were rated as satisfactory.

M 11: Entry Level Self Assessment Exam (O: 2, 3, 4)

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Thirty-three students completed this exam at the end of fall semester 2007. Raw scores ranged from 119 to 76 (out of
possible 140) for average score of 98. These scores are scaled by the National Board of Respiratory Care with a raw score of 75 meeting passing criteria.

Target for O3: use of technology
This secure exam is given via the Web. Feedback is provided on each content area.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-three students completed this exam at the end of fall semester 2007. Raw scores ranged from 119 to 76 (out of possible 140) for average score of 98. These scores are scaled by the National Board of Respiratory Care with a raw score of 75 meeting passing criteria.

Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
This secure exam is given via the Web. Feedback is provided on each content area.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-three students completed this exam at the end of fall semester 2007. Raw scores ranged from 119 to 76 (out of possible 140) for average score of 98. These scores are scaled by the National Board of Respiratory Care with a raw score of 75 meeting passing criteria.

M 12: Capstone course (O: 1, 4, 5)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-five students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 96%.

Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
Students should achieve 85% or higher on written and oral assignments

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-five students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 96%.

Target for O5: professional behaviors of advanced RT students
Students should achieve 85% or higher on written and oral assignments

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-five students enrolled in this course with a class average for written assignments of 96%.

M 13: Mid-Program comprehensive exam (O: 2, 3, 4)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-four students completed the exam at the end of summer semester 2007. Maximum score 94, minimum score 75 out of 100 possible points with an average of 83%.

Target for O3: use of technology
A score of 75% or greater

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-four students completed the exam at the end of summer semester 2007. Maximum score 94, minimum score 75 out of 100 possible points with an average of 83%.

Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
A score of 75% or greater

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Thirty-four students completed the exam at the end of summer semester 2007. Maximum score 94, minimum score 75 out of 100 possible points with an average of 83%.

M 14: NBRC Entry Level CRT (O: 2, 3, 4)
All students must successfully complete the National Board for Respiratory Care's (NBRC) Entry Level Exam, and obtain the "Certified Respiratory Therapist" credential to demonstrate cognitive mastery of entry level skills. The exam is given via a web-based format.

Target for O2: advanced respiratory therapy skills
passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
During spring 2008, seniors in the last semester of the RT curriculum scored 97% (31/32) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

Target for O3: use of technology
passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
During spring 2008, seniors in the last semester of the RT curriculum scored 97% (31/32) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

Target for O4: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
passing score as determined by the NBRC

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
During spring 2008, seniors in the last semester of the RT curriculum scored 97% (31/32) on the first attempt for the entry level CRT exam.

M 15: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 2, 3, 4)
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).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The class of 2008 had 27 of the 32 graduates (84%) earn the RRT credential.

Target for O3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The class of 2008 had 27 of the 32 graduates (84%) earn the RRT credential.

Target for O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
The class of 2008 had 27 of the 32 graduates (84%) earn 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
- 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):
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: advanced respiratory therapy 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: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: use of technology
- Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: use of technology

Implementation Description: May 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of Respiratory Therapy
Additional Resources: Funding to purchase exam for each student at $200 per student.

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: Departmental Exit Exam | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- Measure: Departmental Exit Exam | Outcome/Objective: use of technology
- Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
- Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: use of technology

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.

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 in the past with low response. Emailed copies of the evaluation were used this year with an improvement in returns. We will continue to refine our process to increase the response further.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: advanced respiratory therapy skills
- Measure: Employer Survey - Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care
- Measure: Employer Survey - Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: professional behaviors of advanced RT students
- Measure: Employer Survey - Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: technical performance of advanced RT skills
- Measure: Employer Survey - Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
- Measure: Employer Survey - Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: critical thinking skills within respiratory care

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Graduate Surveys
Six months post graduation, graduates are asked to evaluate their satisfaction with the program preparation for performance of clinical skills and professional behaviors. We have used DataArc, a web-based system in the past but with low response. We emailed copies this year to graduate and had small success. We will continue to refine our process to increase the response rate.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Graduate Survey-Affective | Outcome/Objective: communication skills both orally and in writing
  | critical thinking skills within respiratory care | professional behaviors of advanced RT students
  Measure: Graduate Survey-Psychomotor | Outcome/Objective: technical performance of advanced RT skills
  | advanced respiratory therapy skills | critical thinking skills within respiratory care

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

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 three years students have been encouraged to take this exam prior to graduation. As a result of the 3-year pilot, we will require successful passage of this exam as a graduation requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
  | advanced respiratory therapy skills | critical thinking skills within respiratory care | critical thinking skills within respiratory care | use of technology | use of technology

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of the Division of Respiratory Therapy
Additional Resources: Funding to purchase exam for each student at $200 per student.

NBRC Written Registry Exam
This is a measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken just before graduation, and involves predominately "application" and "analysis" items. The past three 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 and we have followed this for 3 years. Beginning with the fall incoming class, successful passage of this exam will be required for graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Departmental Exit Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
  | critical thinking skills within respiratory care | use of technology
  Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: advanced respiratory therapy skills
  | critical thinking skills within respiratory care | use of technology

Implementation Description: Fall semester 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty of Division of Respiratory Therapy
Additional Resources: Funding to purchase this exam for each student which is $190.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
As we compare our data this year with data from last year we see improvement in several areas. There was a small increase in surveys returned from employers and graduates with the results continuing to be very good. The biggest gains came from the Written RRT and NBRC Clinical Simulation exam. Ninety percent of our students passed the Written RRT exam prior to graduation this year compared to 76% last year. For the Clinical Simulation exam, 79% successfully passed this exam on the first attempt prior to graduation as opposed to only 39% last year. The increased use of computer simulation practice by the RT faculty, more effective use of clinical practice time, an increased expectation of our students, combined with an increased rigor in our program assisted us in progressing to our goals.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Multiple requests via email will be needed to increase the response rate of the employer and graduate surveys. We also will continue to follow the procedures outlines above to show further improvement in our goals and objectives.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Critical thinking in the application of research (M: 3)</th>
<th>An entry-level understanding in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics (M: 1, 3)</td>
<td>Demonstrate advanced level competence in the use, interpretation, and troubleshooting of advanced ventilatory techniques and cardiopulmonary monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Technical and scientific communication skills (M: 1, 3)</td>
<td>Demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Evaluation of RT literature (M: 1)</td>
<td>Intensive review of respiratory care literature to prepare for thesis or project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Understanding Health Policy in the US (M: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Understanding of advanced topics in RT (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examinations and projects (grades) from advanced courses in RT master’s core curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
Score of at least 90% as graded by the instructor or advisor on the final exam or project for advanced core courses.

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**
All students in RT 6030, 6040 and/or RT 7090 scored at least 90% or higher.

#### Target for O3: Technical and scientific communication skills
Score of at least 90% as graded by the instructor or advisor on the final exam or project for advanced core courses.

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**
All students in RT 6030, 6040 and/or RT 7090 scored at least 90% or higher.

#### Target for O4: Evaluation of RT literature
Score of at least 90% as graded by the instructor or advisor on the final exam or project for advanced core courses.

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**
All students in RT 6030, 6040 and/or RT 7090 scored at least 90% or higher.

#### Target for O5: Understanding Health Policy in the US
meets course requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will show mastery of material by successful passage of a comprehensive final examination in HHS 8000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O5: Understanding Health Policy in the US
Final exam score of 90% or higher.

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Met**
All students scored 90% or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Demonstrate appreciation of the research process (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O1: Critical thinking in the application of research
Completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings** 2007-2008 - Target: **Partially Met**
Since the last report, there have been 2 successful thesis defenses and one successful project completed. There are currently 7 graduate students working towards the requirement of a thesis or project.
### Target for O2: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
Completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Since the last report, there have been 2 successful thesis defenses and one successful project completed. There are currently 7 graduate students working towards the requirement of a thesis or project.

### Target for O3: Technical and scientific communication skills
Completion of thesis or graduate project for graduation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Since the last report, there have been 2 successful thesis defenses and one successful project completed. There are currently 7 graduate students working towards the requirement of a thesis or project.

### 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
- **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:** 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

#### Integrated bachelor’s to master’s entry RT program
Applicants to our traditional undergraduate program were encouraged to apply to this new admission option if they already had a bachelor’s degree with all prerequisites completed. We admitted 4 students under this option last fall and will admit a new cohort of 5-6 in fall semester 2008.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Demonstrate appreciation of the research process | **Outcome/Objective:** Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
  - **Technical and scientific communication skills**
  - **Understanding of advanced topics in RT | Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics**
  - **Technical and scientific communication skills**
- **Implementation Description:** on-going each fall
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty in Division of Respiratory Therapy

#### Re-formatting RT 7095
RT 7095, Special problems in Respiratory Therapy is not being utilized as effectively as possible. As we mentor more graduate students in the thesis process, we will re-format this into a data analysis and interpretation course to be used as a second statistics course after HHS 6000. The purpose is to re-enforce knowledge from HHS 6000 and concentrate on interpretation of respiratory care data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Rubric development for evaluating thesis proposals
The development of a rubric is needed for evaluating thesis proposals.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Demonstrate appreciation of the research process | Outcome/Objective: Advanced understanding of respiratory care topics
- Critical thinking in the application of research | Technical and scientific communication skills
- 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: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director and graduate faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our graduate program is expanding and we are beginning to have students successfully complete the thesis process. Thus far our students are performing well in their content courses and are meeting requirements for graduation.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Use of a rubric will help to strengthen the research methods sections of thesis proposals and the nurturing of the Integrated master's will need to be continued.
### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized  
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
1.16 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.17 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.18 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.19 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
1.20 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.21 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.22 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.23 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
1.24 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs  
1.25 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline  
1.26 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation  
1.27 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success  
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation  

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.
**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Faculty find program rigorous and current (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty find the MS-RMI (MRM) program to be a rigorous and current in its treatment of financial risk management concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Employers recruit MRM graduates (M: 1, 2, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers find the MS-RMI (MRM) graduates to be highly sought after job candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Recruitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Target for O2: Employers recruit MRM graduates**

The Advisory Board will find the MRM curriculum relevant and MRM graduates to be highly sought after job candidates.

**M 2: Alumni Survey - Career Competency (O: 2, 3)**

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...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Employers recruit MRM graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Graduates value the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Student performance in MRM 8600 (O: 4, 5)**

Evaluation of student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations in the referenced courses will be completed each May or June for the prior academic year. MRM 8600 is the first course students take in our MRM, MAS, and PhD programs. In addition, we often attract first-year PhD students from the finance department to take this course. The course covers economic models of risk and risky decision-making, the microeconomic approach to asset valuation in both static and dynamic models, and end by introducing students to binomial 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand technical concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty will report satisfaction in student performance on exercises, case studies, written assignments and examinations, in terms of the stated outcomes/objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Student Performance in MRM 8320 (O: 4, 6)**

Evaluation of student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8320 Stochastic Risk Management Models will be completed each May for the prior academic year. MRM 8320 is required for MRM and MAS programs. It is cross-listed with AS 4320. The course covers non-life loss models with an introduction to stochastic processes. The first part of the course covers single-period models including severity models, frequency models, compound distributions, and aggregate loss models. The second part covers multi—period models by introducing stochastic processes with emphasis on Markov chains, Poisson processes, and Brownian motion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand technical concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction with student performance on all related MRM 8320 coursework, in terms of the stated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty member will report satisfaction with student performance on all related MRM 8320 coursework, in terms of the stated learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 symptotic 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 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Ability to analyze data and construct models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MRM Program Director will report satisfaction with student performance on all coursework related to Econ 8750 and Econ 8780, in terms of the stated learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Student performance in MRM 8610 (O: 4, 5, 8, 10)**

Evaluation of student performance on all coursework 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 and continuous time stochastic processes including Itô’s formula, change of measure, and martingales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand technical concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Director and/or teaching faculty and report satisfaction in student performance on all coursework related to MRM 8610, in terms of the specified learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Perform valuations of traded financial assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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).

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).

M 11: Student performance in MRM 8620 (O: 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10)
Evaluation of student performance on all coursework 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).

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).

### Target for O7: Ability to analyze data and construct models
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).

### Target for O8: Construct and value financially engineered 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).

### Target for O9: Make recommendations about firm’s risk exposures
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).

### Target for O10: Communicate mathematical and statistical analyses
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).

---

#### 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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MRM Business Advisory Committee
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Employers recruit MRM graduates
  - **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 academic year
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

##### Further emphasize student communication skills
Revise courses to further emphasize the development of students’ oral and written communication skills. The MRM Advisory Board suggested having students present problems in a formal setting, be video-taped, and have that tape reviewed by faculty together with the student. This suggestion may be implemented.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MRM Business Advisory Committee
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Employers recruit MRM graduates
  - **Implementation Description:** 2007-2008 academic year
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips

##### 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
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.

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

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?

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Risk Management & Insurance (Risk & Insurance) MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
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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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

SLO 9: Graduates value the program (M: 2, 3, 4)
MS-RMI (R&I) graduates value the program.

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

Findings 2007-2008 - 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. Their review and recommendations were included as part of the 2006-2007 assessment report. The Panel will meet again in Spring 2009. For the record, below is a summary of the Panel’s findings: 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

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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. Their review and recommendations were included as part of the 2006-2007 assessment report. The Panel will meet again in Spring 2009. For the record, below is a summary of the Panel’s findings: 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

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

**Findings 2007-2008 - 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. Their review and recommendations were included as part of the 2006-2007 assessment report. The Panel will meet again in Spring 2009. For the record, below is a summary of the Panel’s findings: 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

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses (mean = 4.25 on a 5-point scale). The lowest rated course with a score of 3.67 was RMI 8150 Corporate Risk Management. These results represent a marked improvement from last year. [SURVEY RESULTS](#)

#### Target for O2: Career placement

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses (mean = 4.25 on a 5-point scale). The lowest rated course with a score of 3.67 was RMI 8150 Corporate Risk Management. These results represent a marked improvement from last year. [SURVEY RESULTS](#)

#### Target for O4: Relevance to various stakeholders

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses (mean = 4.25 on a 5-point scale). The lowest rated course with a score of 3.67 was RMI 8150 Corporate Risk Management. These results represent a marked improvement from last year. [SURVEY RESULTS](#)

#### Target for O9: Graduates value the program

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (an average score greater than of 3.0 on a 5-point scale) in the level of risk management competency obtained across various courses.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni were highly satisfied with the level of risk management competency obtained across various program courses (mean = 4.25 on a 5-point scale). The lowest rated course with a score of 3.67 was RMI 8150 Corporate Risk Management. These results represent a marked improvement from last year. [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**

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes (mean = 3.92 on a 5-point scale). This rating represents an increase from last year's score of 3.52. The highest level of satisfaction was reported for "enhancement of analytical skills," (mean = 4.43), while the lowest was reported for "coverage of international topics"/"emphasis on theory and its application" (mean = 3.57). >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O2: Career placement**

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes (mean = 3.92 on a 5-point scale). This rating represents an increase from last year's score of 3.52. The highest level of satisfaction was reported for "enhancement of analytical skills," (mean = 4.43), while the lowest was reported for "coverage of international topics"/"emphasis on theory and its application" (mean = 3.57). >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O4: Relevance to various stakeholders**

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes (mean = 3.92 on a 5-point scale). This rating represents an increase from last year's score of 3.52. The highest level of satisfaction was reported for "enhancement of analytical skills," (mean = 4.43), while the lowest was reported for "coverage of international topics"/"emphasis on theory and its application" (mean = 3.57). >>SURVEY RESULTS

**Target for O9: Graduates value the program**

Alumni will report above average satisfaction (average score greater than 3.0 on a 5-point scale) across various program attributes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported above average satisfaction with the level of risk management competency obtained across a variety of specified program attributes (mean = 3.92 on a 5-point scale). This rating represents an increase from last year’s score of 3.52. The highest level of satisfaction was reported for “enhancement of analytical skills,” (mean = 4.43), while the lowest was reported for “coverage of international topics”/“emphasis on theory and its application” (mean = 3.57). >>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**

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 2007-2008 - 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
Student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000 will be reported as satisfactory by the appropriate instructor(s).

Findings 2007-2008 - 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 O6: Recommend risk management approaches
Student performance on all coursework related to RMI 8000 will be reported as satisfactory by the appropriate instructor(s).

Findings 2007-2008 - 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.

M 6: Student performance on RMI 8050 (O: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8)
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.

Target for O3: Structure and solve problems
Student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling will be reported as satisfactory by the course instructor(s).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Dr. Lorilee Schneider – Assessment of RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2008 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 rating 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. Dr. Eric Ulm, who taught the course during the Fall 2007 semester, was similarly satisfied with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI8050, and provided the following report: I was pleased with the performance of the students in the Fall 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is very difficult, and students gave it 4.8/5 in difficulty on the evaluations, and many individuals commented on the difficulty. Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. By the end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimates means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.

Target for O5: Identify and articulate sources of risk
Student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling will be reported as satisfactory by the course instructor(s).

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Dr. Lorilee Schneider – Assessment of RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2008 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 rating 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. Dr. Eric Ulm, who taught the course during the Fall 2007 semester, was similarly satisfied with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI8050, and provided the following report: I was pleased with the performance of the students in the Fall 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is very difficult, and students gave it 4.8/5 in difficulty on the evaluations, and many individuals commented on the difficulty. Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. By the end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimates means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.
**Target for O6: Recommend risk management approaches**

Student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling will be reported as satisfactory by the course instructor(s).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider – Assessment of RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2008 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 rating 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. Dr. Eric Ulm, who taught the course during the Fall 2007 semester, was similarly satisfied with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI8050, and provided the following report: I was pleased with the performance of the students in the Fall 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is very difficult, and students gave it 4.8/5 in difficulty on the evaluations, and many individuals commented on the difficulty. Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. By the end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimates means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.

**Target for O7: Quantify risk exposures and make recommendations**

Student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling will be reported as satisfactory by the course instructor(s).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider – Assessment of RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2008 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 rating 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. Dr. Eric Ulm, who taught the course during the Fall 2007 semester, was similarly satisfied with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI8050, and provided the following report: I was pleased with the performance of the students in the Fall 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is very difficult, and students gave it 4.8/5 in difficulty on the evaluations, and many individuals commented on the difficulty. Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. By the end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimates means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.

**Target for O8: Effective professional oral/written communication**

Student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling will be reported as satisfactory by the course instructor(s).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Dr. Lorilee Schneider – Assessment of RMI 8050 Risk Management Modeling I was satisfied, overall, with the performance of the students in the Spring 2008 RMI 8050 course. The course is difficult (students typically give the course a 4.5-4.8/5.0 rating 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. Dr. Eric Ulm, who taught the course during the Fall 2007 semester, was similarly satisfied with student performance on all coursework relevant to RMI8050, and provided the following report: I was pleased with the performance of the students in the Fall 2007 RMI 8050 course. The course is very difficult, and students gave it 4.8/5 in difficulty on the evaluations, and many individuals commented on the difficulty. Despite this, the student learning was very good, and is reflected in the grades given. By the end of the course, students were generally able to construct spreadsheet models and simulations of credit risk, interest rate risk, stock market risk and mortality risk as well as combinations of risks. They could estimates means, standard deviations and Value-at-Risk from both empirical and simulated data and make comparisons.

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

**Create Industry Panel**

An Industry Panel will be created, comprised of representatives from all of the major areas of risk management. The Panel will meet once every two years, starting in the fall of 2006 and at two-year intervals thereafter. The Panel’s agenda will include a formal assessment of the contributions of the RMI Program to risk management education, including suggestions for improvement and areas of possible future development. The panel will include employers that regularly hire our students as interns and our graduates to discern attitudes toward the content of the program, as well as their assessments of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for change. The same panel will review both the undergraduate and graduate RMI programs.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
  - Relevance to employers | Structure and solve problems
- **Implementation Description:** December 1, 2006
**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 Date: 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 major components of this course. With group and individual projects, students will present 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 majors.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
- Measure: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to employers
- Measure: Alumni Survey - RMI Competency | Outcome/Objective: Relevance to various stakeholders

Implementation Description: Fall 2007

Responsible Person/Group: William Feldhaus

**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
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes | Relevance to employers
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Program Attributes | Relevance to various stakeholders
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Student Services | Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program

Responsible Person/Group: William Feldhaus

**Improvement of student/alumni services**

Survey and interview data suggests that there continues to be a general lack of satisfaction with non-academic services (computer services, placement activities, etc.). We will continue to work with the appropriate college and university personnel to make improvements in this area. Robinson's Career Management Center is now fully operational. The RMI Department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. Her duties include: (1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students; (2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department; (3) work closely with the Office of Graduate Admissions to manage the graduate (MS/MAS) application process; and (4) provide dedicated staff support for the department's scholarship award process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey - Student Services | Outcome/Objective: Graduates value the program
- Measure: Biennial Industry Panel | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
- Measure: Relevance to employers

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Revisions to the MS-RMI curriculum

The Department of Risk Management and Insurance is engaged in a major revision of its MS-RMI program curriculum that started in early 2007. This revision should be finalized by the end of Summer 2008, with implementation in Fall 2009 at the earliest. Several courses will be phased out of the curriculum, while new courses are being planned including a new foundation course to replace RMI 8000 Perspectives on Risk and Insurance, which has not been offered in two years. Another 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 major components of this course, with group work and presentations of 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 majors.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Objective/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Objective/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey - Program Attributes</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Career placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates value the program</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to various stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates value the program</td>
<td>Relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates value the program</td>
<td>Relevance to various stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance on RMI 8000</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Effective professional oral/written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and articulate sources of risk</td>
<td>Recommend risk management approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and solve problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance on RMI 8050</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Effective professional oral/written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and articulate sources of risk</td>
<td>Quantify risk exposures and make recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend risk management approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and solve problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips/William Feldhaus

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The MS-RMI program continues to attract high quality graduate students from around the world. Our student body currently represents 17 different countries. Incoming MS-RMI students continue to be among Robinson's most qualified, with the second highest average GMAT scores (average=638) of any specialized masters program in the College. Our extensive curriculum revisions continue and should be completed by the end of this summer. These revisions will emphasize the quantitative and analytical components of the curriculum. Over the past two years, we have seen significant improvement in the communication skills (both written and oral) of our students, as measured by projects, group tasks, and presentations. This year's alumni survey results show higher levels of satisfaction with the program, across the board. We have achieved a good level of success in terms of graduate placement into quality positions with major firms. We have added faculty and staff resources to increase the value of the student experience at Robinson and to ensure professional success. 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?

The process of revising the MS-RMI curriculum has been slower than we anticipated. We originally hoped to have the changes in place by Fall 2008. It appears that we will be one year late. The department needs to increase our numbers of MS-RMI (non-mathematical risk management) students. We hope that the improvements we are making to the curriculum will address this issue. These changes will also address the lack of integration of our actuarial science and risk management graduate students. Although we have had some successes in our career placement efforts, alumni survey and interview data suggests that there may still be a general lack of satisfaction with non-academic services (computer services, placement activities, etc.). We will continue to work with the appropriate college and university personnel to make improvements in this area. To that end, the department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to work closely with our business contacts and with college/university personnel to add value to the student experience across all of our programs.
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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: Effective verbal communication (M: 3, 5, 6)
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**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

## SLO 4: Identification of risky situations (M: 5, 6)
Students will be able to recognize uncertainty and its impact on individual, business, and societal decision making.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

## SLO 5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions (M: 5, 6)
Students will employ ethical decision practices in situations of certainty and uncertainty, regardless of analytical solutions calculated.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

## SLO 6: Effective problem structuring (M: 5, 6)
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**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

## SLO 7: Effective problem solving (M: 5, 6)
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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

## SLO 8: Effective written communication (M: 4, 5, 6)
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
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

## 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 2007-2008 - 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. Their review and recommendations were included as part of the 2006-2007 assessment report. The Panel will meet again in Spring 2009. For the record, below is a summary of the Panel's findings: 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 2007-2008 - 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. Their review and recommendations were included as part of the 2006-2007 assessment report. The Panel will meet again in Spring 2009. For the record, below is a summary of the Panel's findings: 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 (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 their career competency across various knowledge and skill areas. They will also report above average satisfaction across a variety of stated university/college/department level services.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction with the BBA-RMI Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in their professional careers, across various knowledge (mean = 3.90 on a 5-point scale) and skill (mean = 4.14) areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. The alumni group rated program services as substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.69 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.98). At the university level, "advisement" was rated the lowest, but at 3.29, it still came in above the 3.0 threshold. At the department level, "alumni networking" was rated the lowest at 3.42. Although the score is higher than the 3.0 threshold, the department is addressing this issue (see Action Item #1).

Target for O2: Career placement

>>SURVEY RESULTS
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. They will also report above average satisfaction across a variety of stated university/college/department level services.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Alumni reported a high level of satisfaction with the BBA-RMI Program, in terms of providing them with the level of proficiency necessary to succeed in their professional careers, across various knowledge (mean = 3.90 on a 5-point scale) and skill (mean = 4.14) areas. All of the individual areas were rated well above the 3.0 threshold. The alumni group rated program services as substantially above average, for college/university level services (mean = 3.69 on a 5-point scale) and for department level services (mean = 3.98). At the university level, "advisement" was rated the lowest, but at 3.29, it still came in above the 3.0 threshold. At the department level, "alumni networking" was rated the lowest at 3.42. Although the score is higher than the 3.0 threshold, the department is addressing this issue (see Action Item #1).>>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 informational and emphasizes a summary of lessons learned from the research conducted. In RMI 4700, the presentation is both informational and persuasive as the students select and debate their positions on a business issue based on research conducted.

**Target for O3: Effective verbal communication**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on course presentations.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Teaching faculty across the curriculum agree that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades awarded in major courses reflect the same results. The program director continues to implement strategies across the curriculum to improve student's verbal communication.

**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**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on course writing requirements.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

RMI 4300, RMI 4350, and RMI 4700 have been used in the past to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that target levels for effective written communication were met and they are all satisfied with student performance in these courses. The program director continues to implement strategies across the curriculum to improve students' communication skills, both verbal and written.

**M 5: Senior RMI assessments within coursework (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

The Program Director will submit a report of senior student evaluations on assignments and exams, to be completed each May for the prior academic year.

**Target for O3: Effective verbal communication**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of "effective problem solving," but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.
Target for O4: Identification of risky situations

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving,” but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and student performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.

Target for O5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving,” but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and student performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.

Target for O6: Effective problem structuring

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of “effective problem solving,” but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and student performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.
**Target for O7: Effective problem solving**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of "effective problem solving," but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.

**Target for O8: Effective written communication**

Students will reach a satisfactory level of proficiency across the stated learning outcomes, as measured by performance on assignments and exams.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Overall, BBA-RMI students performed satisfactorily across the BBA-RMI curriculum. 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: In terms of students' abilities to recognize uncertainty in decision situations, performance across senior-level courses was satisfactory. RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 in particular require students to show this skill. Performance in this category met target levels on related assignments. Ability & Choice to Make Ethical Business Decisions: This continues to be an area of weakness across the BBA-RMI curriculum. Graduating student responses to program survey indicate a general lack of confidence among the respondents in their ability (hypothetically) to recognize the ethical choice(s) if given a questionable decision dilemma. Teaching faculty reported a lack of confidence in some students' choice (rather than ability) to take an ethical path, if faced with a dilemma. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Problem Structuring: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported satisfaction with students' abilities to structure problems overall. Every course in the major curriculum requires students to structure, not just solve already structured problems. Outcomes in this area met target expectations for all courses except RMI 4150. This result was expected, as this course is highly mathematical as compared with other courses in the curriculum. Effective Problem Solving: Teaching faculty continue to report some difficulty among a substantial number of students in problem solving skills. Student grades and performance on coursework in RMI 4150, RMI 4300 and RMI 4350 do not reflect target levels of "effective problem solving," but met target levels in other major courses. Further action will be taken to address these issues. Effective Written Communication: RMI 4300, RMI 4350 and RMI 4700 are used to evaluate writing skills among BBA-RMI majors. Overall student grades and performance on coursework indicate that target levels were met in this area. Effective Verbal Communication: Teaching faculty across the curriculum reported that students met target levels for effective verbal communication. Presentation grades and student performance on coursework across major courses reflect same results.

**M 6: 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 outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

**Target for O4: Identification of risky situations**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

**Target for O5: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions**

Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated outcomes.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this...
measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Effective problem structuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - **Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Effective problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - **Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Effective written communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students will report satisfaction with their level of competence across the stated outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings** 2007-2008 - **Target: Not Met**

A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students preclude meaningful analysis of the data gathered for this measure. For next year’s report, we will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

**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 at large. 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: Graduating Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions
- Effective problem solving | Effective written communication
- 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

Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs
The department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. Her duties include:(1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students;(2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department; and(3) provide dedicated staff support for the department’s scholarship award process.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Career placement
- Relevance to employers

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lorilee Schneider/Ednisha Riley

Design a more effective graduating student survey
A low level of participation among this year’s graduating students prevented meaningful analysis of the data gathered to measure student attitudes toward the content of the program and its impact on career competency. For next year’s report, RMI Department leaders will develop a more efficient way of surveying graduating students.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Graduating Student Survey | Outcome/Objective: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions
- Effective problem solving | Effective problem structuring | Effective verbal communication | Effective written communication | Identification of risky situations

Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Lorilee Schneider

Targeted revisions to BBA-RMI curriculum
The RMI faculty will continue to make minor revisions across the curriculum throughout the upcoming academic year to improve these objective areas: (1) Spend more course time 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.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior course presentations | Outcome/Objective: Effective verbal communication
- Senior course writing requirements | Outcome/Objective: Effective written communication
- Senior RMI assessments within coursework | Outcome/Objective: Ability/choice to make ethical business decisions
- Effective problem solving | Effective problem structuring | Effective verbal communication | 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?
The BBA-RMI program continues to attract quality undergraduate students from around the world. Our student body currently represents 35 different countries. As was the case last year, results of this year’s learning outcomes assessment reflect overall program strength in the areas of risk assessment, problem structuring, and verbal communication. Furthermore, we recorded improvements in student performance across the target courses in the area of effective business communication (an Action Item #1 in last year’s report). We will continue to reinforce these areas of strength. RMI courses across the undergraduate curriculum, especially senior-level courses, continue to be revised to increase the use of technology in completing coursework (i.e., Microsoft Excel and other specialized computer applications, online research, specialized research databases, etc.). The department has hired an Administrative Specialist - Student Affairs to add value to the student experience across all of our programs. This person will be a
single point of contact for all student related issues. Her duties include:(1) design and execute activities through the student organizations to advise/support student leaders and enhance the leadership/communication skills of our students;(2) work closely with Robinson Career Management Services to coordinate Job Fairs, placement efforts, and share information between the college and the department; and (3) provide dedicated staff support for the department’s scholarship award process.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although the department is satisfied with our overall enrollment numbers and international diversity of the student body that represents the BBA-RMI program, we would like to increase the diversity of geographic areas within the United States from which we attract our majors. There continues to be a general failure to meet target levels for ethical decision making. We will continue to make minor revisions across the curriculum throughout the upcoming academic year to improve these objective areas: (1) Spend more course time 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Effective Communication Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Effective Use of Computer Technology (M: 6, 7, 8, 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Effective Analytical Skills (M: 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (M: 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**4 Critical Thinking**

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**

5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 7th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 56th among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.25, which is down from 5.27 in 2006-07.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 8th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 43rd among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.87, which is down from 5.92 in 2006-07.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as 5.82 with a slight right skew to the distribution.

**Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as 5.82 with a slight right skew to the distribution.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as 5.82 with a slight right skew to the 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.904 with a tight distribution. No team scored 4 or lower. |

| Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills |
| Scale score of five or higher with low variation. |
| Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.904 with a tight distribution. No team scored 4 or lower. |

| Target for O4: Effective Team Membership |
| Scale score of five or higher with low variation. |
| Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.904 with a tight distribution. No team scored 4 or lower. |

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.91 with a tight distribution. |

| Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills |
| Scale score of five or higher with low variation. |
| Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.91 with a tight distribution. |

| Target for O4: Effective Team Membership |
| Scale score of five or higher with low variation. |
| Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| Students were rated at 5.91 with a tight 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
| In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 10th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 57th among the 
186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.41, which is up from 5.30 in 2006-07. |

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met |
In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 11th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 54th among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.29, which is up from 5.17 in 2006-07.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students rated a 6.48 on this measure with a strong right skew. This suggests the standard needs to be revisited.

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students rated a 6.48 on this measure with a strong right skew. This suggests the standard needs to be revisited.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students rated a 6.48 on this measure with a strong right skew. This suggests the standard needs to be revisited.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Students were rated at an average of 3.904 on this measure. The results however were rather bi-modal with a significant distinction between students performing excellently and those performing mediocre.

**Target for O2: Effective Use of Computer Technology**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Students were rated at an average of 3.904 on this measure. The results however were rather bi-modal with a significant distinction between students performing excellently and those performing mediocre.

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Students were rated at an average of 3.904 on this measure. The results however were rather bi-modal with a significant distinction between students performing excellently and those performing mediocre.

M 10: Ability to Think Critically (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students’ ability to think critically.

**Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills**
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 9th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 63rd among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.82, which is the same as in 2006-07.

M 11: Ability to Define Problems (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhances students’ ability to define problems.

**Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills**
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 11th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 69th among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.79, which is down from the 5.82 in 2006-07.

M 12: Ability to Solve Problems (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students` ability to solve problems.

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 10th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 71st among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.82, which is down from the 5.86 in 2006-07.

M 13: Ability to Analyze an Interpret Data (O: 3)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students` ability to analyze and interpret data.

Target for O3: Effective Analytical Skills
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In 2007-08 RCB was 2nd among the 7 comparison schools, 6th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 44th among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.91, which is the same as in 2006-07.

M 14: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 4)
The extent to which the BBA program enhanced students` ability to work in teams.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
In 2007-08 RCB was 4th among the 7 comparison schools, 18th among the 36 Carnegie Class schools and 116th among the 186 participating institutions. The student raw score 5.46, which is up when compared to the 5.45 in 2006-07.

M 15: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)
The extent to which students in their team projects exhibited the ability to function as a team in executing their roles with respect to the semester-long simulation and the final project deivables. The measurement will be through student team projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Student`s teams were rated at 5.57 by the instructors on this measure. There was a larger variation on this variable than on any other variable measured.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
For 2007-2008 the ETS assessment exam was used for this question. In that survey of 450 graduating seniors 35% indicated that they would not pursue education beyond their BBA degree and another 13% were undecided.

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.
Development 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: Terminated
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

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: Terminated
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Effectiveness in Oral Communication | Outcome/Objective: Effective Analytical Skills
Measure: Effectiveness in Written Communication | 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?
The results in this year's assessment were compared to the results in 2005 on the same measures, taken by the same instructors. There was improvement in student teams' ability to synthesize and present findings. There was not improvement in the students' skills in using software effectively, with some students lagging still. Finally, the students' ability to work on teams seems to have bifurcated. Some student teams are running more effectively, but there also is an increase in dysfunctional teams.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Objectives and the Measures are valid for our purposes and are consistent with the Mission of the BBA program. The Assessment techniques, however, suffer from three flaws. First, many of the measures rely on student self-reported perceptions. Second, evaluations conducted by instructors are done of group, not individual activities. Third, some measures have not been taken because of these and other limitations.
Creative Decision-making Skills that Incorporate Global and Ethical Dimensions

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

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
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Development of Leadership Skills (M: 11, 12, 13)
Students should be able to demonstrate leadership skills including: inspiring a shared vision, challenging conventional processes, and motivating others.

Institutional Priority Associations
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions (O: 1, 2)
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale for a reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions in the business decision process.

Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met
The average score was 4.61.

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 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.63

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.63

**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 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.37.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.37.

**M 4: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions (O: 1, 2)**
Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ recommendation integrated functional dimensions in the business decision process.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.87.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.87.

**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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.87.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**
Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.87.

**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.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: **Not Met**
The average score was 4.42.
Target for **O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 4.42.

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

This over-all measure was not taken in 2007-08.

Target for **O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

This over-all measure was not taken in 2007-08.

**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**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 4.5.

**M 9: Assessment of Resources and Capabilities of a Firm (O: 2)**

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ skills to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its resources and capabilities.

Target for **O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 4.75.

**M 10: Analysis of Competitive Environment (O: 2)**

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ skills to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its competitive environment.

Target for **O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

The average score was 3.87.

**M 11: Business Leadership Skills (O: 1, 4)**

An assessment of students’ performance on assignments in the business communications course.

Target for **O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**

Not yet developed

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

This measure was not used in 2007-08.

Target for **O4: Development of Leadership Skills**

Not yet developed
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met

This measure was not used in 2007-08.

### M 12: Productive Membership on a Team (O: 3, 4)

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ functioning as productive members of a team that was responsible for a specified task.

**Target for O3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.74.

**Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.74.

### M 13: Functional Expertise Contributions (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Student projects that are common across all sections of the Strategic Management course are analyzed by instructors and evaluated on a seven point Likert-type scale on students’ contributing their functional expertise to problem solving in a cooperative project.

**Target for O1: Creative Decision Making Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.71.

**Target for O2: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.71.

**Target for O3: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.71.

**Target for O4: Development of Leadership Skills**

Scale score of five or higher with low variation.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The average score was 6.71.

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

**Review of assessment measures**

Review and revise as needed all assessment measures.

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

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

- **Measure:** Analysis of Competitive Environment | **Outcome/Objective:** Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure:** Assessment of Resources and Capabilities of a Firm | **Outcome/Objective:** Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure:** Developed and defended business/corporate strategy | **Outcome/Objective:** Creative Decision Making Skills | Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure:** 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
**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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Reasoned analysis integrated ethical dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Reasoned analysis integrated functional 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 Global Aspects in MBA Course**

A more global perspective on all business courses needs to be introduced. This can be done by seeing the cases and other class material raise and discuss the particular dynamics that a global environment presents to a firm and industry.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Analysis of Competitive Environment | **Outcome/Objective**: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure**: Business Leadership Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Developed and defended business/corporate strategy | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Identification of Critical Success Factors | **Outcome/Objective**: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure**: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Recommendation integrated global dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: College Assessment Committee; MBA Steering Committee

**Individual Performance Level Measurement**

All measures need to be converted to the level of individual student analysis and away from group project analysis. Primary Trait Analysis will be the goal for each measure. Additional venues for measuring student performance consistent with the individual-level measures will have to be developed.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Finished
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**: Business Leadership Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team | **Outcome/Objective**: Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- **Measure**: Development of Leadership Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Developing Membership on a Team | **Outcome/Objective**: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
- **Measure**: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **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**: Recommendation integrated global dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills
- **Measure**: Recommendation integrated ethical dimensions | **Outcome/Objective**: Creative Decision Making Skills

Implementation Description: March 1, 2007
Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner
Additional Resources: Time and people
Revision of all Measurement Methods for the MBA

Action Plan Captured by Assessment in Functional Concentrations In each of the Departments one or more MBA concentrations are currently assessed. These assessments are conducted along the lines of the Mission and Objectives that the Departments have set for students in those concentrations. In most cases, Departments are conducting assessment by looking at student work in advanced classes in the discipline. These exercises, across disciplines, almost always include some of the general elements that we wish to assess in our students. The College will develop global assessment criteria for Measures 1 through 6 and have ratings collected on those measures as part of the Departments assessment of the same (indeed many might be the exact same questions the Departments are assessing). Raw data from the Departments will be reported to the College and the results will be aggregated there. Measures remaining in MBA 8820 with Modification MBA 8820 will have to remain the class for measurement of a student's team skills as this is the only class in which we can assure that students are doing a common team project that will allow optimal control in observation. In the past assessments of the team measures 12 and 13 was done by the instructor of the team as a whole. Measures 7 through 10 remain distinctive to the strategy/capstone perspective. There is a need to work with the MBA 8820 faculty in developing methods of assessing individual students on these traits during the course of the semester without reliance on the team project. Measure Still in Need of a Venue Measure 11, Developing Business Leadership Skills, captures one of the MBA programs main objectives. However there is currently no way to effectively measure this across the student body. Developing both a measure and a venue is an priority task for the College.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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: Business Leadership Skills | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Development of Leadership Skills
- Measure: Developed and defended business/corporate strategy | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Functional Expertise Contributions | Outcome/Objective: Contributing Members of an Effective Work Team
- Creative Decision Making Skills
- Development of Leadership Skills
- 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
- Development of Leadership Skills
- Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated ethical dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Reasoned analysis integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Recommendation integrated ethical dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Recommendation integrated functional dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance
- Measure: Recommendation integrated global dimensions | Outcome/Objective: Creative Decision Making Skills
- Skills to Assess/Diagnose Organization Performance

Implementation Description: December 1st 2007
Responsible Person/Group: College Assessment Committee; MBA Steering Committee
Additional Resources: There is a need for strong support from the College leadership, particularly in incenting, cajoling and otherwise motivating Department Chairs to be active and supportive of assessment.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In terms of the results that remain promising, the strength of team work in the MBA program remains distinctive. Other traits are high, bit are a little short of the goal of a 5.0 average on the scale that is used. Only analysis of a firm in the context of the competitive environment remains a disappointing score.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Objectives and the Measures are valid for our purposes and are consistent with the Mission of the MBA program. The Assessment techniques, however suffer from two flaws. First, most of the evaluations conducted by instructors are done of group activities, not individual activities. Second, two measures have not been taken because of these and other limitations. Addressing these issues in the MBA program is particularly challenging. The challenge comes from the fact that MBA's are not in a lock-step program that forces students into a common capstone class in their graduating semester, as is the case in the BBA program. The collective data has, therefore, been moved to the Strategic Management class, which is only taken by about 50% of the students in their last semester. As a result, not only do the results suffer from the two flaws mentioned above, we are not getting students only at their exit point from the program. Thus, program assessment is more challenging.
**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 |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation |
| **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 |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| **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 |
| 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| **Strategic Plan Associations** |
| 6.3 Graduate Experience |

| O/O 6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented insti (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 conference 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 |
| 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success |
| **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.

Target for O3: Competency in research
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

Target for O4: Teaching excellence
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of 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.

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.

Target for O2: Mastery of methodology
At least 80% of students should pass on first attempt.

Target for O3: Competency in research
At least 80% of students should pass on first attempt.

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.

Target for O2: Mastery of methodology
Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

Target for O3: Competency in research
Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

Target for O4: Teaching excellence
Majority of students meeting requirements on a timely basis.

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.

Target for O3: Competency in research
At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B- or better.

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.

### Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Participation
All students should be assigned to a research faculty member and engaged in scholarly work on research projects before reaching the dissertation phase.

### 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.

### Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Participation
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.

### Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institutions
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.

### 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.

### Target for O2: Mastery of methodology
At least 90% of students should pass on the first attempt.

### Target for O3: Competency in research
At least 90% of students should pass on the first attempt.

### M 8: Dissertation final defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 6)
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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institutions
This Achievement Target was created through the WEAVEonline Data Conversion process because the associated 'Target Performance Level for Program' field in Version 3.5 was blank. Please edit this information to enter the actual Achievement Target for this Measure-Outcome/Objective combination.

### M 9: Performance graduate research assignments (O: 1, 2, 3)
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.

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**Target for O3: Competency in research**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**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).

**Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institute**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**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).

**Target for O4: Teaching excellence**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institute**  
At least 95% of students should receive a grade of S (satisfactory).

**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**  
target to be developed

**Target for O2: Mastery of methodology**  
target to be developed

**Target for O3: Competency in research**  
target to be developed

**Target for O5: Professional Development and Academic Community Participation**  
target to be developed

**Target for O6: Placement of graduates in research-oriented institute**  
target to be developed

---

**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.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure**: Annual evaluation | **Outcome/Objective**: Mastery of methodology
  - **Measure**: Performance in research methodology courses | **Outcome/Objective**: Mastery of methodology
- **Implementation Description**: Summer 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Doctoral Coordinators group

**Review of student progress**

In order to insure that students stay on track, the Doctoral Program Office has asked each academic unit to outline specific guidelines for annual review of each student’s progress. The Doctoral Program Office is developing a more comprehensive online tracking system that will help unit to have access to each student’s current status, including tracking program milestones such as comprehensive examinations.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure**: Annual evaluation | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Assessment of Teaching Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Comprehensive examinations | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Dissertation final defense | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Dissertation proposal | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Performance graduate research assignments | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
  - **Measure**: Performance in research methodology courses | **Outcome/Objective**: Mastery of methodology
  - **Measure**: Performance in seminar coursework | **Outcome/Objective**: Comprehensive understanding of subject
- **Implementation Description**: Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Associate Director of Doctoral Program, unit doctoral coordinators

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**
Mission / Purpose
The School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose overarching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, 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, program evaluation, advocacy 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 is used.
1. Supervisor greeted SEE in friendly, warm manner. 2. Supervisor opened session with an appropriate amount of structure. 3. Supervisor and SEE set and worked on specific goals during the session. 4. Supervisor facilitated SEE’s talking during sessions by using appropriate active listening skills. 5. Supervisor offered constructive feedback about SEE’s weaknesses. 6. Supervisor provided alternative ways of intervening or responding, especially when correcting SEE’s errors. 7. Supervisor encouraged SEE’s professional reflection. 8. Supervisor and SEE are able to discuss the supervisory relationship when needed. 9. Supervisor kept the session on track. 10. Supervisor was supportive of SEE. 11. Supervisor 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 table 30 pts. Implementation of Project (individual counseling, small group 50 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 Completion 40 pts. Lesson Plans Evaluation and Implications Write up 30 pts Total 200 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

**M 5: Action Research Project (O: 3)**

Students will implement a selected accountability protocol following the ASCA National Model. Students will be required to: a) adapt the original template to the ASCA Guidance Curriculum Results Report template and make any necessary changes b) implement the intervention, c) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention based on the adapted template, d) complete the Guidance Curriculum Results Report, and e) evaluate the original lesson plans, include and explain the rationale for any adapted lesson plans, and describe process, lessons learned, and implications for your school counseling program. The finished product will be an easy to understand program evaluation manual to evaluate Academic, Personal/Social, and Career Preparedness interventions used when working with individual students, small groups of students, and in classroom guidance at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The intent of this assignment is to produce a finished product that can be used by school counselors across the state. Scoring Guide for Action Research Project in CPS 8661 CPS 8661 Research Project Scoring Guide Conversion of table to ASCA recommended protocol table 30 pts. Implementation of Project (individual counseling, small group 50 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 Completion 40 pts. Lesson Plans Evaluation and Implications Write up 30 pts Total 200 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 2007-2008 - 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
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: 2007-2008
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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 School Counseling MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training professional school counselors who are prepared to plan, provide and evaluate a developmentally appropriate, preventive school counseling program that focuses on school success for all students. Skills developed during the program include interpersonal communication, group facilitation, assessment, leadership, advocacy, and program planning and evaluation. An integral part of this program is consulting with teachers, parents, administrators and community resources, as well as coordinating programs.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Understands career development & life factors (M: 6)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of career development and related life factors, including career development theories, resources, and planning.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 2: Understands counseling and consultation process (M: 7)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of counseling and consultation processes, including characteristics and behaviors that influence the helping process, essential interviewing and counseling skills, and counseling theories that provide a consistent model(s) for selecting appropriate counseling interventions.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 3: Understands group purpose for counseling (M: 5)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of group purpose, development, dynamics, counseling theories, methods and skills for different types of group work including task, psycho educational and counseling groups.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 4: Understands individual and group approaches (M: 9)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of individual and group approaches to assessment and evaluation, including statistical concepts, and selecting, administering, and interpreting appropriate instruments.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

O/O 5: Understands educational research methods (M: 10)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of research methods, statistical analysis, needs assessment, and program evaluation.
Relevant Associations: Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Understands the foundations of school counseling (M: 11)</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: 13)</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: 12)</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: 8, 14, 16)</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: 1, 15)</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>
<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 11: Understands cultural context (M: 3)</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: 4)</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: 2)</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: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the combined quizzes.

**M 2: Comprehensive Test 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.
2. INDIVIDUAL MULTI-CULTURAL PROJECT: Learning theory in the classroom is supported and enhanced by practical experience in the field. Additionally, research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals (see Ancís & Szymanski, 2001; Pope-Davis, Breaux, & Liu, 1997; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998). Towards this end, you will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend your learning, and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. This learning opportunity consists of two parts: A. Individual Multi-Cultural Plan (IMCP): Attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from your own. Observe the verbal and non-verbal behaviors of individuals present. Initiate social interactions. Choose an event that you have never attended or one that is outside of your typical experience. This experience should challenge your comfort zone. Depending upon your past experience and perspective, this could include attending a lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered support group; an American Indian festival, etc. Before engaging in the experience, briefly meet with me. You will have the opportunities to: •interact with someone who is culturally different than you. •Apply theory and interpersonal skills that are culturally responsive to someone who is culturally diverse compared to you. •Gain specific knowledge about a particular culture and enhance that knowledge from the perspective of a participant in that cultural context. •provide experiences for the IEP student to become empowered and connected through your use of active listening •share knowledge about your own culture, cultural identity, and provide IEP students with practice for English fluency B. Conceptualization Paper: Throughout your multi-cultural exchange, you are expected to gather knowledge that will inform your practice and experiences with clients in the future. It is expected that some of the knowledge you gain will come from your conversations with those from a culture different than your own. This informal data collection will be supplemented with reading outside of class. To that end, you are expected to read a minimum of 2-3 journal articles or book chapters (or a combination of both) that directly relate to the cultural group(s) identified in your IMCP. You will share the knowledge you have gained throughout your individual multi-cultural project in a 4-5 page paper (not counting references and cover page). You will receive additional details in class about the organization and content of this paper. Your paper needs to be written in APA style (fifth edition) except that you do not need an abstract.

**Target for O11: Understands cultural context**
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the paper.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a B or better on the paper.

**M 4: Project on Individual Development CPS 7500 (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: -What developmental milestones you encountered -What developmental events did you have which were expected -What developmental events did you not have which would have been expected -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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of students earned a Satisfactory grade on the project.

**M 5: Group Prospectus CPS 6450 (O: 3)**
Students will work in small groups to prepare a detailed proposal for the development and implementation of a group you might lead in the near future. Each Prospectus is expected to include the following: •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

**Target for O3: Understands group purpose for counseling**
At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better for the prospectus.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a B or better for the prospectus.

**M 6: Career Devel./Counseling Intervention CPS 7300 (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 intervention including a literature review and a problem statement, 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students earned a grade of B or better on the intervention.

**M 7: Quizzes & Final Test Interpersonal Skills CPS 6410 (O: 2)**

Quizzes - Students will be quizzed on each chapter of reading. Each quiz will have 5 questions and be worth 5 points. Quizzes are designed to assess conceptual knowledge of the reading. A student must be able to answer 4 out of the 5 questions correctly to satisfy the course requirement. A quiz may contain multiple choice, short answer, and/or brief essay questions. Students must earn 80% on each of the 12 quizzes to be eligible to take the final test. Final Test - There will be a cumulative test at the end of the semester. Students must obtain 86 points or higher on the TEST to pass the test and the course. The test will cover all assigned readings, CD-ROM materials, handouts, and lectures. The test will evaluate synthesis, application, recognition, and recall of the course content. It will consist of multiple choice and short answer questions only.

**Target for O2: Understands counseling and consultation process**

At least 90% of the students must earn 80% or better on each of the 12 quizzes and 90% must earn at least 86% on the final test.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned 80% or better on each of the 12 quizzes and 100% earned at least 86% on the final test.

**M 8: Site Supr’s Eval Small Group Coun. Skills CPS 7681 (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, 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 at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

94% of the students were rated at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

**M 9: Case Study in Appraisal CPS 7450 (O: 4)**

I. Content (10 pts) a. Definition of Assessment b. How Assessment relates to the counseling process c. Intake questions d. Anticipated Responses e. Issues that need to be addressed/evaluated further f. Selected Instruments g. Rationale for Selection h. Legal, Ethical, Moral issues i. Resolutions j. Multicultural Considerations II. Organization (2pts) a. Reasonable Order b. Subheadings

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.

**M 10: Closing the Gap Project CPS 7661/7681 (O: 5)**

Students must analyze the demographic data from their school and determine a gap between demographic groups in achievement, formulate a plan to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method will be selected to evaluate the results of the plan. They will then write a paper describing their efforts. Program Evaluation Outline Major Headings (this is to be completed for the Closing the Gap project.) Use APA style. (10 points) I. Topic for Classroom Guidance Unit or Small-Group Counseling Experience (1-2 pages) A. Rationale for selection based on demographic needs and goals of the school (10 points) B. Literature review of the topic (3-4 pages) C. Detailed description of lesson plans used to address the topic (15 points) D. Detailed Description of the Population Served (1-2 paragraphs) (10 points) E. Detailed Description of the Method of Evaluation and Type of Analysis Used (15 points) F. Results of the Evaluation (based on academic or behavioral indicators, attendance, or students’ perception of school climate) (10 points) G. Discussion Include a summary of your findings, what you learned, what you would and wouldn’t do next time (15 points) H. Reference page (5 points)

**Target for O5: Understands educational research methods**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

**M 11: Comprehensive test CPS 6020/6030 (O: 6)**

CPS 6020/6030 provides an overview of the unique issues of school counseling, including history and philosophy, professional roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession. The comprehensive test covers all aspects of the course to assess student student knowledge.

**Target for O6: Understands the foundations of school counseling**
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the comprehensive test.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive test.

M 12: Closing the Gap Project CPS 7661/7681 (O: 8)
Students must analyze the demographic data from their school and determine a gap between demographic groups in achievement, develop and implement a program to close the gap, and evaluate the program. A research method will be selected to evaluate the results of the plan. They will then write a paper describing their efforts. Program Evaluation Outline Major Headings (this is to be completed for the Closing the Gap project.) Use APA style. (10 points) I.Topic for Classroom Guidance Unit or Small-Group Counseling Experience (1-2 pages). Rationale for selection based on demographic needs and goals of the school (10 points) II.Literature review of the topic including best practices on addressing this topic (3-4 pages) (10 points) III.Detailed description of lesson plans used to address the topic Include any resources used (15 points) IV.Detailed Description of the Population Served (1-2 paragraphs) (10 points) V.Detailed Description of the Method of Evaluation and Type of Analysis Used (15 points) VI.Results of the Evaluation (based on academic or behavioral indicators, attendance, or students' perception of school climate) (10 points) VII.Discussion Include a summary of your findings, what you learned, what you would and wouldn't do next time (15 points) VIII.Reference page (5 points)

Target for O8: Understands program development
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a B or better on the Closing the Gap Project.

M 13: Site Supervisor’s Overall Evaluation CPS 7681 (O: 7)
The site supervisor evaluates students on all aspects of contextual knowledge of school counseling, including professional identity, dispositions and behaviors, program development and evaluation, cultural awareness, advocacy, and leadership, individual counseling, small group counseling, classroom guidance, and consultation and collaboration.

Target for O7: Understands contextual dimensions of SCO
At least 90% of the students will be rated by their on-site supervisor at the novice, independent level.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated by their on-site supervisor at the novice, independent level or above.

M 14: Site Supr’s Eval Classrm. Guidance Skills CPS 7681 (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 at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
94% of the students were rated at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

M 15: Site Supr’s Eval of Consultation Skills CPS 7681 (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 at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
94% of the students were rated at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

M 16: Site Supr’s Eval Ind. Counseling Skills CPS 7681 (O: 9)
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 closure techniques.

Target for O9: Demonstrates skills in counseling and guidance
At least 90% of the students will be rated at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
94% of the students were rated at the novice, independent level on all of the skills listed.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain and monitor
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: School counseling faculty

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

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 at the novice, independent level or above.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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 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. 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 initiated a new course last year that specifically addresses advocacy, leadership, and action research in the schools that we believe has made the program stronger. In addition, we continue to evaluate the sites and 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.
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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 6: Understands School Organization, Policy & Climate (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.
Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 7: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children’s mental health
Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 8: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop. (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand school psychology practice in multiple settings and adopt appropriate professional practices.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

O/O 11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively.

Relevant Associations: NCATE

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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’s rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s acquisition of required skills and competency in targeted areas.

Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio- particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio—particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All 21 students in the practicum class passed the practicum portfolio. There was some confusion about elements of the portfolio—particularly about the interplay between assessment reports and intervention reports. We will address this programmatically in 2008/09.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students met acceptable levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O9: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met  
All students met acceptable levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O10: Understands School Psych., Practice and Develop.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met  
All students met acceptable levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O11: Effectively utilizes Information Technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the students will obtain acceptable or better scores on each element of the program as rated by internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Met  
All students met acceptable levels

**M3: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**

The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports, consultation reports, assigned activities and the site-based supervisors’ rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Implements Data-Based Decision Making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met  
3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre- the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second prac., so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Effective at Consultation and Collaboration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met  
3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre- the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second prac., so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met  
3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre- the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second prac., so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Understands Socialization and Life Competencies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met  
3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre- the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second prac., so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands diversity re: development &amp; learning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:** Partially Met
3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

3 students did not complete internship portfolio to satisfactory levels. 2 of them were from the "old" program pre-the second practicum. The reasons they did not complete the internship portfolio were that they did not use the data as well as they should have- this skill is required in the second practicum, so it is not surprising that students from before that requirement did not pass.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all students had at least satisfactory ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Develop better data management procedures**
Regular need for easy access to data collected as part of the program means we need to develop a better way to store, organize, and access data.

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

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

**Measure:** Faculty STARS Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Practicum Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Supervisor Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic 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
- **Priority:** Medium

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

**Measure:** Faculty STARS Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Practicum Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Supervisor Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** Stephen D. Truscott, Program Coordinator

**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):**

**Measure:** Faculty STARS Rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies


**Measure:** Internship Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Develops Cognitive and Academic competencies
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Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 School Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**O/O 2: Use and Conduct Research (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Graduates use and conduct research.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**O/O 3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice (M: 1, 4)**
Graduates demonstrate the tenets of ethical practice.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**O/O 4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych. (M: 1, 4)**
Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**O/O 5: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization (M: 1, 5)**
Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All graduates (there was only 1) have found employment

**Target for O2: Use and Conduct Research**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All graduates (there was only 1) have found employment

**Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice**
80% of graduates will be employed in positions that are appropriate for their degree.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All graduates (there was only 1) have found employment

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All graduates (there was only 1) have found employment

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All graduates (there was only 1) have found employment

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
6 students completed predissertation research. This is a marked improvement from previous years.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Students are progressing- albeit slowly.

#### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
6 students passed comprehensive exams!!

**Target for O3: Follow the tenets of ethical practice**
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
6 students passed comprehensive exams!!

Target for O4: Understands principles of psych. and school psych.
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
6 students passed comprehensive exams!!

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students are progressing well on cognate completion

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

Monitor and encourage progress
The program faculty will improve our monitoring of student progress in the programs and encourage students to complete various elements of the program in a more timely manner.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Successful completion of cognate | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- Measure: Successful completion of comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
- Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research

Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Steve Truscott
Additional Resources: none

Monitor and Maintain
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2006-2007 academic year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation of employment status | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- | Follow the tenets of ethical practice | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Understands the practice of school psychology | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of cognate | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- Measure: Successful completion of comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Follow the tenets of ethical practice
- Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and Conduct Research

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Stephen D. Truscott, Program Coordinator

maintain & monitor
students are making good progress. The appropriate action it to maintain program policies and monitor progress.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation of employment status | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- Follow the tenets of ethical practice | Understands principles of psych. and school psych. | Understands the practice of school psychology | Use and Conduct Research
- Measure: Successful completion of cognate | Outcome/Objective: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization
- 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: immediately
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Additional Resources: none
Revise measures to include more direct data
Program was requested to revise measures to include more direct data.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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: 2008/2009
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?
We are making good progress, but need to continue to attend to dissertation completion.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Need to revise some objectives to include more direct data.

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 stable, national ranking is up (currently 7th in research productivity), external funds are up. Admissions pool is MUCH stronger than was three years ago and before. APA self study process was grueling but successful (through to self study report- final COA report is not yet available). In 2008/09 we will implement a major program redesign to bring the extremely credit heavy and long PhD program (168 credits BA to PhD) in line with national standards (New program is about 140 credits). Dr. Varjas earned associate professor and tenure, which is good for program stability. Student progress on predissertation is strong. We continue to need to attend to dissertation completion.

Contributions to the Institution
We have key faculty who serve in critical roles throughout the university. External funding is increasing (Roach has been particularly successful here). 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. Cadenhead is chair of COE/PEF diversity committee. Decker was featured for DNA work with class.

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. We have been particularly successfully at attracting high quality students from under-represented populations. 38% of our students are from diverse groups. Faculty received national recognition (Meyers, Truscott, Varjas, Decker, Roach) 22 students (PhD and EdS) presented at 2008 meeting of National Association of School Psychologists. Truscott is Editor of Journal of Educational and psychological Consultation. Decker won Research Article of the Year for ACA. School-based research programs in 3 metro districts. APA self study report was excellent and identified many areas of strength. Areas for improvement were minimal. New program begins with 2008/09 year.

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 ( we hopefully addressed this for the 2008/09 myear by decreasing enrollment somewhat). Change in program is needed to increase successful program completion- adressed for 2008/09. Funding of students is 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 in the early parts of the program. Major curriculum revision will be implemented in 2008/09 year. Predissertation and Dissertation mentoring in improving rapidly.

Research and Scholarly Activities
see highlights. This is a terrific and productive faculty.

Public/Community Service
Students provide many hours of service to local districts. Faculty provide consultation to local districts. Meyers, through school safety center provides service to many non-school agencies (e.g., Atlanta Housing Authority, PBS). Faculty and students serve on national committees (e.g., Truscott on NASP LD Identification advisory committee). Cadenhead on Board of Directors for Georgia Association of School Psychologists. Varjas on NASP Bullying web-cast.

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.
### 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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**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 their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

**Target for O4: Understand issues in science and technology**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**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.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

66% or 2 student scored a 5 on element rubric while the other 33 % (1 student) scored a 4 on element rubric. Therefore, all students either met or exceeded expectations.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.
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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

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 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

Teacher candidates will submit at least three documents/artifacts demonstrating professional growth activities/plan within the last two years. Teacher candidates will be given choices in terms selecting the artifacts such as becoming active members of NSTA/GSTA (National Science Teachers Association/ Georgia Science Teachers Association), in-service professional development workshops, presentations at conferences, and publications in scholarly journals etc. Teacher candidates will describe what they learnt from their experiences with the help of a reflection paper. They will describe the artifacts that document their professional growth. They will evaluate their own professional growth, list their ongoing goals and design a plan to meet these goals. The professional growth plan and the reflection paper will be graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.

**Target for O10: Strives for continuous professional growth**

90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

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 exceed expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates
candiates 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of 3 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all 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: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages learners in the nature of Science
- **Measure:** Portfolio element: Curriculum Exploration/Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Can engage learners in inquiry
- **Measure:** Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Promotes science in the community
- **Measure:** 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
Additional Resources: Create survey or establish formal focus group

**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

**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 during the 2008-2009 academic year. The COE has facilitated this process by: • Having the P-12 colleagues from both PDS and partner schools work with us in the ongoing evaluation of our programs. • In spring 2006, steps were taken to create a PDS adhoc committee focusing on professional development schools and to discuss the composition of the PEF advisory council. The recommendation is that the PEF advisory council henceforth be comprised of the site coordinators and/or administrators from our PDS schools. This PEF wide advisory council will meet three times a year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Professional Growth Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Strives for continuous professional growth

Implementation Description: February 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Science Education faculty, MSIT dept., and College of Education

**Providing diverse experiences in the program**

Our student population comprises of in-service teachers that may be working with a specific student population. The program assessment has been revised to help us meet this goal. The candidates are now required to plan, design, and present the peer-teaching lesson targeted on a student population that is different from their own teaching context such as demographics, learning
styles, and ELL learners etc. The existing rubric is being revised by the program faculty and data collection for this aspect of the program will start in the 2008-2009 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: February 2009
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 outcomes/objectives?
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 (inservice 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?
We have implemented two changes discussed in our actions plan for 2006-2007. For providing diverse experiences to our students (in-service teachers), we now require the students to do a revised program assessment (peer teaching). For getting an input and feedback from our pk-12 stakeholders in various programs, the COE has facilitated the process of getting via PDS and other partner schools and forming a PDS adhoc committee. Our program faculty will be participating in that process to address this issue.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Science Education--TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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.

**O4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

57% 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 3.96 with a standard deviation of 0.656. Faculty show 76% students are at or above target while students rate themselves as 95% at or above target (with a standard deviation of .514). However, while the faculty rate the students in low in content understandings, 92% of the students (11 out of 12 completers) passed the broad-field science GACE exam for certification.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Supervisors ratings show that 10 of 14 completers demonstrate the ability to provide a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of learners.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

This area was a stronger area (despite the data discrepancy as noted in other standards). The TEEMS science has 93% of preservice teachers providing instructional opportunities that are variety and related to diverse learners.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. Faculty reported that 79% of preservice teachers in TEEMS science are developing and not yet proficient in the area of using multiple teaching and learning strategies that promote higher levels of learning. This also indicates that 79% of the preservice teachers are adjusting teaching strategies in response to student feedback. This is below the 90% goal for TEEMS Science. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not yet adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more
could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the data was reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our program this spring for the first time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

This area was a stronger area (despite the data discrepancy as noted in other standards). The TEEMS science has 93% of preservice teachers consistently findings ways to motivate students and to create a learning community in which students are actively engaged in teaching.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. Faculty reported that 10 of 14 students are developing (79%) and not proficient in the area of communication strategies to promote higher level learning. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the data was reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our program this spring for the first time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. Faculty reported that 10 of 14 students are developing (79%) and not proficient in the area of the preservice teachers’ knowledge of students, community and curriculum goals/standards and the use of this knowledge to create learning experiences that are appropriate for these students and curriculum goals. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the data was reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our program this spring for the first time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. Faculty reported that 10 of 14 students are developing (79%) and not proficient in the area of assessment and the use of
assessments to guide instruction. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our program is not
gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be
necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC
standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are
not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the data was
reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our program this
spring for the first time.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

85% of completers were able to reflect constructively on their teaching practice.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty.
Faculty reported that 10 of 14 students are developing (79%) and not proficient in the area of effective communication with
school personnel, parents, and the community. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our
program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing.
It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the
INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if
they are not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the
data was reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our
program this spring for the first time.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Examining the data provided by faculty regarding the outcomes of the TEEMS MEd program, there are several areas of strength. It is
reported (by faculty ratings) that our 14 TEEMS MEd completers score at 86% in the consistently at or above desired levels of
performance in understanding and responding to needs of different students in their classrooms (whether different by race/ethnicity
or by special needs). It is reported (by faculty ratings) that our 14 TEEMS MEd completers score at 81% in demonstrating
consistency in providing instructional variety in the classroom. It is reported (by faculty ratings) that our 14 TEEMS MEd completers
score at 90% in providing appropriate structure and guidance in creating a supportive and challenging learning environment for their
students. We are confident that our experiences and assignments in meeting needs of diverse learners through instructional variety
and purposefulness has had an affect on our students’ performance in these areas. Part of this success may be due to the rigorous
requirements for constant reflection upon teaching whether it be their own teaching or others’ teaching. Our completers score at 88%
on the faculty assessment of their overall performance in reflective practitioner actions.

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

Examining aggregated data on 14 program completers, it was shown that 69% of the responses from faculty assessors found our
TEEMS graduates to have consistent and correct content understandings. Occasionally faculty noted (30% of the markings) that
students demonstrated at least one science content area in which our students were not as prepared to teach. This is bothersome,
yet expected as the state requires our broad-field certified teachers to have 24 credit hours of science content in their major field
of study, and 15 credit hours in two additional fields of study (such as a major in biology and the equivalent of minors in two areas such
as physics and earth sciences). A drawback of this certification process with the state is that students would have one science area
(study, and 15 credit hours in two additional fields of study (such as a major in biology and the equivalent of minors in two areas such
as physics and earth sciences). A drawback of this certification process with the state is that students would have one science area
which they are least experienced. This may help to facilitate the connections needed to their other content area strengths to master
the content in that particular area. The other area needing attention in our program is the area of assessment where our 14
completers scores 64% in ratings from faculty. It is possible that different types of assessment and experiences with assessment
should be emphasized more explicitly and more consistently through our program. Action can include additional explicit activities and
reflection during the academic year to have students practicing a variety of assessment techniques during their field placements. The
pass rate for science content broad-field GACE exam is 93% (13 of 14 students) and well within expectations. *It is possible that there
is a data reporting problem with this year's faculty evaluations: Overall, there is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. Faculty reported that on most standards, 10 of 14 students are developing (79%) and not proficient. There is either a misunderstanding by faculty of the term “developing” or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. It is hoped that instead of passing on three teachers who are not yet ready to teach, that the data was reported erroneously, which may well be the case as we had two new faculty rating preservice teachers in our program this spring for the first time.
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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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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, 7120, 8280, 8310, 8320, 8340, & 8270.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

5 out of 5 students met or exceeded outcomes based upon the following assignments: literature review, ethnography evaluation, issues-related papers, historical investigation & interview.

**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, 8310, 8320, 8340, & 8270.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

5 out of 5 students met or exceeded outcomes based upon the following assignments: literature review, ethnography evaluation, issues-related papers, historical investigation & interview.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

3 out of 3 students met the measure in completing a master’s project.

**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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critical analysis essays | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies critical perspectives
  - Measure: Issues-related research papers | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies normative perspectives
  - Measure: Research Study | Outcome/Objective: Designs and conducts research
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Foundations Coordinator

**Revised Collection of Data**

Spreadsheet data will include a column for the title of thesis/project as well as additional academic accomplishments (e.g., paper presentations or publications), if applicable.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critical analysis essays | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies critical perspectives
  - Measure: Issues-related research papers | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies normative perspectives
  - Measure: Research Study | Outcome/Objective: Designs and conducts research
- **Implementation Description:** May 2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Social Foundations Coordinator

**Strategic Planning Action**

We intend to survey current students, recent graduates, and program faculty to assess areas that might need improvement. LOAs
will be revised based upon this information.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical analysis essays | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies critical perspectives
- Measure: Issues-related research papers | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates and applies normative perspectives
- Measure: Research Study | Outcome/Objective: Designs and conducts research

Implementation Description: June 2009
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?
Five of 5 students met or exceeded the 3 named outcomes/objectives. According to the collected data, all students demonstrated the foundations of education knowledge base: (1) Students demonstrated an understanding of race, class, and gender constructs as applied to schooling and society; (2) They indicated ability to analyze and utilize educational theories through preparation of critical essays; (3) The three students who completed their coursework and either a final project or thesis demonstrated an ability to design, analyze, and write a major research study.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Given that we have a small cohort of master’s students we are able to closely monitor their progress and the quality of their academic work. However, we will continue to review the LOAs in order to identify any gaps in the evaluations of our students.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 1)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Target for O1: Is committed to student learning and development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were no program completers for the 2007-2008 year.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 2)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Target for O2: Can apply expertise for learning and development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were no program completers for the 2007-2008 year.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 3)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were no program completers for the 2007-2008 year.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 4)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:
There were no program completers for the 2007-2008 year.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 5)
A summary rating derived from culminating paper, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

**Target for O5: Participates in profession’s learning communities**

75% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

There were no program completers for the 2007-2008 year.

**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

**Increase recruitment/retention**

To increase enrollment in program, efforts will be made to revise the department website, increase program visibility through emails to listserves, and recruitment through GSU undergraduates and other public outlets, such as printed brochures. In addition, orientation sessions will be offered to all new M.Ed. Social Studies students to help them successfully navigate the program and understand program requirements.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 2008-09 school year
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Social Studies Faculty Program Members

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

There is a need for increased recruitment and/or retention for this program.

---
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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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: Understands student development re: learning (M: 2)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 3)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 4)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 5)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 6)</strong></td>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
99% of our 33 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.
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of our 33 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

96% of our 33 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 STARS database for this standard.

**Target for O4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our 33 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

97% of our 33 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

95% of our 33 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
97% of our 33 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of our 33 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 9: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 9 (O: 9)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O9: Practices professional reflection
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of our 33 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 10: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 10 (O: 10)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning
75% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of our 33 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3</td>
<td>Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5</td>
<td>Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8</td>
<td>Understands and uses assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Development 2005-2006, Implementation 2007-2008
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan
Analysis of Content Requirements

Changes in Social Studies certification in Georgia have resulted in the elimination of the Broad Field Social Studies certification and adoption of individual certifications in History, Economics, Geography, Psychology, and Sociology. There is a need to analyze the current requirements for SS content courses in light of these changes.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS SS faculty: Joe Feinberg and Chara Bohan

Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 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

Maintain Continuity of Instruction

Students in the TEEMS SS program performed well on all performance assessments. In 2005-2006, 2 new faculty have joined the program. The primary focus for this year will be to ensure all faculty understand the program design and content and are able to maintain the quality of the program with the increased size of our cohort.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge
- Measure: Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 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

Improve student performance

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

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 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.
### Improve student performance

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:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 1</td>
<td>Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 10</td>
<td>Involves school and community in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 2</td>
<td>Understands student development re: learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 3</td>
<td>Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 4</td>
<td>Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 5</td>
<td>Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 6</td>
<td>Uses communication skills and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 7</td>
<td>Can effectively plan for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 8</td>
<td>Understands and uses assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty STARS ratings on Standard 9</td>
<td>Practices professional reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** August 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Joseph Feinberg and other TEEMS social studies faculty.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**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.

### Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2007-2008 Social Work BSW  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Mission of the BSW Program is to prepare entry-level, generalist social workers to assume responsibility for a range of services that deal with the problems experienced by people in a multicultural society.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action (M: 3, 5, 11, 12)**

Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through the gathering of client information and formulating, in collaboration with the client, a plan of action.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Collaboration

**SLO 2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics (M: 1, 6, 7, 8, 11)**

Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through the application of the values and ethics of the profession of social work to specific client, organizational, and community issues.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations (M: 10, 12, 18)**

Students demonstrate written communication skills through research and position papers in subject areas affecting vulnerable populations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

**SLO 4: Written Communication: Social Work (M: 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17)**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 5: Oral Communication: Field Based (M: 4)
Students demonstrate oral communication skills through the completion of a class presentation on their respective field agency.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice (M: 5, 7)
Students demonstrate oral communication skills specific to social work practice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 7: Collaboration: Case Planning (M: 2)
Students demonstrate collaboration skills through case planning with clients.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 8: Collaboration: Social Agencies (M: 4, 6)
Students demonstrate collaboration skills through partnering with other social agencies on behalf of their clients during field internships.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 9: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis (M: 9)
Students demonstrate critical thinking through the development of testable hypotheses and interpreting and analyzing data related to client and system problems.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

SLO 10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning (M: 4, 6, 7)
Students demonstrate critical thinking skills through a personal examination of the experiential learning in field education.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

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

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

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.
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
7 Technology

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26)
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
95% of students received an excellent or good rating

M 2: SW 3720 Social Work Practice I (O: 4, 7)
Paper on Client`s Social History /Personal Values and Diversity

Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
90% of students receive B or higher on assignment

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
89% of students received a B or higher

Target for O7: Collaboration: Case Planning
90% of students receive B or higher on assignment

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
89% of students received a B or higher

M 3: SW 3730 Social Work Practice II (O: 1, 4)
Paper on goals, interventions, and achievement for a client system; social history and case plan

Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
90% of students receive B or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of students received a B or higher

Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work
90% of students receive B or higher

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
98% of students received a B or higher

M 4: SW 4930: Field Education Seminar (O: 5, 8, 10)
Presentations on Agency Placement

Target for O5: Oral Communication: Field Based
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
93% of students received a B or higher on this presentation

**Target for O8: Collaboration: Social Agencies**
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
93% of students received a B or higher on this presentation

**Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning**
95% of students receive B or higher on presentation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
93% of students received a B or higher on this presentation

**M 5: SW 3610 Communication Skills in Social Work (O: 1, 6)**
Video interview with client

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Plan of Action**
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
90% of students received a B or higher

**Target for O6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice**
80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
90% of students received a B or higher

**M 6: SW 4930 & 4940 Field Education (O: 2, 8, 10)**
Field internship evaluations

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% received a Good or excellent evaluation

**Target for O8: Collaboration: Social Agencies**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% received a Good or excellent evaluation

**Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning**
90% of students will receive a Good or Excellent evaluation

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% received a Good or excellent evaluation

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
95% of students received an excellent or good rating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice</th>
<th>95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of students received an excellent or good rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Critical Thinking: Experiential Learning</th>
<th>95% of students will receive Excellent or Good ratings on evaluation final evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>95% of students received an excellent or good rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: SW 4390 &amp; SW 4940: Field Education (O: 2, 11)</th>
<th>Field Supervisor Evaluation Rating (Section I - Community/Organizational Context of Practice) in field internship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>91% received a B or above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related</th>
<th>90% of students will receive B or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>91% received a B or above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: SW 3020: Research in Social Work Practice (O: 4, 9, 13, 14, 15)</th>
<th>Final Exam for the course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work</strong></td>
<td>80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Critical Thinking: Data Analysis</th>
<th>80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O13: Quantitative Skills: Evidenced Based Practice</th>
<th>80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice</th>
<th>80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O15: Technology</th>
<th>80% of students will receive a B or higher on assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: SW 3330 Human Behavior I (O: 3)</th>
<th>Final Paper on Life Course Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations</strong></td>
<td>80% of students will receive a B or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>78% made a B or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students received an excellent or good evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**

90% of students will receive Good or Excellent evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students received an excellent or good evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of students received an excellent rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations**

Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of students received an excellent rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Written Communication: Social Work**

Instructor evaluation of content as appropriate for entry level SW practitioner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of students received an excellent rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% made a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Contemporary Issues: Legislative**

80% of students will receive a B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O15: Technology**

80% of students will receive a B or higher
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

83% received a B or higher

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**

80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O15: Technology**

80% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

### 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

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**

90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**

90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O15: Technology**

90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

**Target for O14: Quantitative: Evaluation of Practice**

90% of students will receive a B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O15: Technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90% received a B or higher

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 18: SW 3020: Methods of Social Work Research (O: 3)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam for the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O3: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations**

80% of students will receive a grade of B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

78% of students received a B or higher

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 19: BSW Learning Outcome #12 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems, and seek necessary organizational change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

84% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 20: BSW Program Outcome Objective #10 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

84% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 21: BSW Program Outcome Objective #11 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will use supervision and consultation appropriate to social work practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

92% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 22: BSW Program Outcome Objective #2 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 23: BSW Program Outcome Objective #6 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

75% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 24: BSW Program Outcome Objective #7 (O: 16)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will use theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to understand individual development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for **O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**

90% of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective
### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
83% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

**M 25: BSW Program Outcome Objective #8 (O: 16)**
Students will analyze, formulate, and influence social policies.

**Target for O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90 % of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**
67% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome. An additional 25% reported that they were somewhat confident in their skills on this objective

**M 26: BSW Program Outcome Objective #9 (O: 16)**
Students will be able to evaluate research studies, apply findings to practice, and evaluate one’s own practice interventions.

**Target for O16: Outcome/Objective Not Specified**
90 % of graduating students will self evaluate as "confident" or "very confident" on this objective

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
92% self evaluated that they were confident or very confident on this program outcome

### 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:** Finished  
**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
- **Quantitative Skills:** Evidenced Based Practice | **Quantitative:** Evaluation of Practice | Technology | **Written Communication:** Social Work
- **Measure:** SW 3330 Human Behavior | **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations
- **Measure:** SW 3610 Communication Skills in Social Work | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
- **Oral Communication:** Social Work Practice
- **Measure:** SW 3720 Social Work Practice I | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration: Case Planning
- **Written Communication:** Social Work
- **Measure:** SW 3730 Social Work Practice II | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
- **Written Communication:** Social Work
- **Measure:** SW 3930: Social Welfare Policy | **Outcome/Objective:** Contemporary Issues: Legislative
- **Contemporary Issues:** Theory Related | **Technology**
- **Measure:** SW 4930 & SW 4940: Field Education Seminar | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration: Values and Ethics
- **Critical Thinking:** Plan of Action

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008

#### 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):**
- **Measure:** SW 3720 Social Work Practice I | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration: Case Planning
- **Written Communication:** Social Work
- **Measure:** SW 3730 Social Work Practice II | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking: Plan of Action
- **Written Communication:** Social Work
- **Measure:** SW 4930 & SW 4940: Field Education Seminar | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration: Values and Ethics
- **Contemporary Issues:** Theory Related

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009

#### Communication
Assessment of student performance on written and oral communication will be examined across multiple sections of these courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: SW 3720 Social Work Practice I | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Social Work
Measure: SW 3730 Social Work Practice II | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Social Work
Responsible Person/Group: BSW Program Committee

Policy
Students in one policy course performed more poorly than the other. Analysis of assignments and instructional methods
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: SW 3930: Social Welfare Policy | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues: Legislative
| Contemporary Issues: Theory Related | Technology
Responsible Person/Group: BSW Program Committee

Research
Examination of performance of students across the research sections.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: SW 3020: Methods of Social Work Research | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Vulnerable Populations
Responsible Person/Group: BSW Program Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
On most of the objectives, the School was able to meet the stated goals. In particular, there was progress over the past year in some of the critical thinking objectives. Behavioral performance in the upper division (4000 level courses) was very strong.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There are significant differences between student performance based upon different sections of the same course. On objectives where "partially met" was selected, differences existed between various sections where some students were able to meet the objective and other sections were not. This finding will be addressed in the BSW program committee during the 2008-09 academic year.
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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, 15)
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, 14)
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, 10, 11)
Students demonstrate the ability to formulate, maintain, and strengthen relationships and partnerships that build healthy communities.
**SLO 5: Leadership and Management (M: 12, 14, 18)**
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, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16)**
Students demonstrate the ability to apply evaluative measures, technological processes, and the management of information to understand and facilitate healthy communities.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 7: Outcome/Objective Not Specified (M: 17, 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 7100 Foundation of Community Partnerships (O: 6)**
Research paper

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice**
90% of students receive B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
90% of students receive B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96% received a A or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnerships (O: 6)

Research paper

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 6: SW 8500 and 8900 Field Education (O: 3, 4)

Field instructor evaluation of Section II of final field evaluation

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96% received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Community/Organizational Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96% received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: SW 8800 Community project (O: 3)

Oral presentation of community project to students, faculty staff

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 8: SW 8500 and 8900 Field Education (O: 1, 2, 3)

Field instructor evaluation of Section V (Social Work Skills) on Field Evaluation

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received an Excellent or Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking: Social and Economic Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received an Excellent or Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received an Excellent or Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 9: SW 8800 Community project (O: 3, 6)
### Group Project

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**M 10: SW 7100 Foundations of Community Partnership (O: 3, 4, 6)**
Community Experience Analysis Paper

**Target for O3: Community/organizational Communications**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**Target for O4: Community/Organizational Development**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**M 11: SW 8800 Community Partnerships (O: 4, 6)**
Implementation of the memorandum of understanding with a host agency or organization

**Target for O4: Community/Organizational Development**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students receive B or higher

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

**M 12: SW 8300 Leadership and Management (O: 5, 6)**
Six analytic and research papers that comprise the class

**Target for O5: Leadership and Management**
90% of students will receive a B or higher on final course grade

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received B or higher

**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**
90% of students will receive a B or higher on final course grade

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
100% received B or higher

**M 13: SW 8900 Field Education (O: 6)**
### Final Program Evaluation paper that includes the role of technology in human services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive B or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: SW 8200 (O: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation on the students’ final presentation and power point presentation</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 evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Leadership and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students receive Excellent or Good evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% received a Good or Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: MSW Program Outcome Objective 1 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critical Thinking: Values and Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will self evaluate as &quot;confident&quot; or &quot;very confident&quot; on this outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89% self evaluated as very confident or confident on this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: MSW Program Outcome Objective #7 (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate skills for influencing necessary organizational and community change to address populations at risk and advance social and economic justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will self evaluate as &quot;confident&quot; or &quot;very confident&quot; on this outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% self evaluated as very confident or confident on this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: MSW Program Outcome Objective #5 (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate communication/facilitation skills in building community partnership structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Outcome/Objective Not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will self evaluate as &quot;confident&quot; or &quot;very confident&quot; on this outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% self evaluated as very confident or confident on this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: MSW Program Outcome Objective #6 (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will conduct community assessments and engage in community resource development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Leadership and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will self evaluate as &quot;confident&quot; or &quot;very confident&quot; on this outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% self evaluated as very confident or confident on this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: MSW Program Outcome Objective #8 (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply knowledge and leadership skills in managing projects and working with community groups and /or organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Outcome/Objective Not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will self evaluate as &quot;confident&quot; or &quot;very confident&quot; on this outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1)
A. Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories
B. Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems
C. Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking
3. Contemporary Issues

SLO 2: Analysis of Contemporary Questions (M: 1)
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
1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking
3. Contemporary Issues

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions (O: 1, 2)
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: Acquisition of Knowledge
Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 from 8 sections of 1101 (343 students), and 7 sections of 1160 (363 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly.

### Target for O2: Analysis of Contemporary Questions

Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 from 8 sections of 1101 (343 students), and 7 sections of 1160 (363 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly.

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

1. We are currently meeting our goals with regard to courses in the core.

   **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
   **Implementation Status:** Planned  
   **Priority:** Low

   **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
   **Measure:** SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions  
   **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge  
   | Analysis of Contemporary Questions

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

Everything seems to be going well in terms of students' performance as measured by these assessment outcomes in our two core courses.

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

Everything is going well; we will continue to assess students with these measures.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Sociology BA**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:13 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

- 5 Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

### 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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**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

**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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Analytical Skills (M: 3)
- 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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: soci 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions (O: 1, 2, 4)

The goal assessment categories here are "Sociological Perspective," "Multicultural Issues," and "Global/International Issues." Five multiple-choice questions were designed to assess competence in each goal area. Instructors in all sections of Soci 1101 and Soci 1160 were requested to select at least one multiple choice in each of the three section and to embed the questions in their final exams. Instructors were free to select more than one question as long there was at least one question to assess each of the three goals.

**Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions**

Students should have mean aggregated scores in the A-B range (above 80%) on each embedded test item.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 from 8 sections of 1101 (343 students), and 7 sections of 1160(363 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of those in 1160 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.
**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 706 from 8 sections of 1101 (343 students), and 7 sections of 1160 (363 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 74% of students in 1101 and 95% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 92% of students in 1101 and 97% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 88% of students in 1101 and 91% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly.

**M2: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

Among the 92 students whose papers were evaluated, the median score was 3.

**M3: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The median rating of 135 students’ analytic skills was 2.52 (up from 2.0 last year).

**M4: 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

The median score for 135 students was 2.8 (up from 2.0 last yr).

**M5: soci 3020 course paper (O: 2, 3, 4)**

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 2007-2008 - Target:**

For the 114 students evaluated on this measure, the median score was 3.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

The median score should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target:**

For the 114 students evaluated on this measure, 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 2007-2008 - Target:**

For the 114 students evaluated on this measure, the median score was 3.

**M6: soci 3020 final exam (O: 2, 3, 4)**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

For the 50 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For the 50 students who took a final exam in this course, the median score was 3.

Target for **O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**
The median scores should be "very good" (3 on a 4-point scale).

### Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For the 50 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
No theory instructors submitted data for this category this year; they only submitted information regarding the final exam in 3030.

**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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For the 87 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
For the 87 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 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
  | Communication Skills | Critical Thinking Skills
- Measure: soci 3020 final exam | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
  | 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 critical thinking | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Implementation Description: 2007-08 academic year.
Responsible Person/Group: instructors of 3010

1. Those who teach social statistics will continue to struggle with the math-related deficiencies of a significant minority of majors.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: 2008-09
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty teaching undergraduate Statistics

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

We are basically serving our majors well, and most of them are doing well in our program. A significant minority of majors continue to have trouble with coursework that is mathematical in nature (our statistics and methods courses are where problems are most likely to arise for students.

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

We will continue to be attentive to problems students have in these areas. With the introduction of CTW courses, all methods classes will include a newly explicit focus on strengthening critical thought and writing. Maybe this will improve student outcomes. Time will tell.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Sociology MA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department’s work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Note: Our program has approximately 80 graduate students and had 13 students graduate with the MA degree during this assessment cycle.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 1: Analytical Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students have acquired the skills to collect data. (B) Students have demonstrated appropriate analytical skills. (C) Students are able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports and articles.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses. (B) Students are able to analyze and interpret data. (C) Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Communication Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students have developed effective written communication and editing skills. (B) Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories. (B) Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems. (C) Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills (M: 1)
(A) Students have developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. (B) Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Thesis Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Masters students orally defend their thesis to their thesis committee and other attending faculty members.

**Target for O1: Analytical Skills**
A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**
A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**
A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**Target for O5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**
A majority of Masters theses will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.
### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Note: Our program has approximately 80 PhD-level graduate students and had 4 students graduate with the PhD degree during this assessment cycle.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills (M: 1)

- (A) Students have developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. (B) Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.3 International Initiatives
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Analytical Skills (M: 1)

- (A) Students have acquired the skills to collect data. (B) Students have demonstrated appropriate analytical skills. (C) Students are able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports and articles.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)

- (A) Students can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses. (B) Students are able to analyze and interpret data. (C) Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

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

- (A) Students have developed effective written communication and editing skills. (B) Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 5: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills (M: 1)

- (A) Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories. (B) Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems. (C) Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Doctoral students orally defend their dissertation to their dissertation committee and other attending faculty members.

**Target for O1: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**

A majority of Doctoral dissertations will meet or exceed a score of 3 ("very good") on a 4-point scale on each item on the departmental rubric.

**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.
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.

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.

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.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Spanish BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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 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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

**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

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

**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**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**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
4 Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

**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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

**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
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**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**
- 2 Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**Target for O9: Oral proficiency**
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

- **Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
  Students score slightly higher than last year.

**M 2: Speaking Spanish (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9)**
All Spanish majors scored 4.72.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Speaking Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Oral proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored over the target but slightly lower than last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Reading Spanish (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Spanish majors scored 4.51.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.

Target for O6: Writing in Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Reading scores remained the same. Over the target.

M 4: Writing Spanish (O: 2, 6, 7, 8)
All Spanish majors scored 4.63.

Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Writing scores are slightly better than last year’s.

Target for O6: Writing in Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Writing scores are slightly better than last year’s.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Writing scores are slightly better than last year’s.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Writing scores are slightly better than last year’s.

M 5: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)
All Spanish majors scored 4.57.

Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students score 4.71 in knowledge of culture. Over the target level and slightly higher than 2006-2007.

Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students score 4.71 in knowledge of culture. Over the target level and slightly higher than 2006-2007.

Target for O4: Speaking Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students score 4.71 in knowledge of culture. Over the target level and slightly higher than 2006-2007.

Target for O5: Reading Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students score 4.71 in knowledge of culture. Over the target level and slightly higher than 2006-2007.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Students score 4.71 in knowledge of culture. Over the target level and slightly higher than 2006-2007.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

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.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O4: Speaking Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O5: Reading Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O6: Writing in Spanish
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher that the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Scores remain higher than the targeted 4.0, but slightly lower than 2006-2007.

**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.

**Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O6: Writing in Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**M 8: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7)**

Spanish majors whose concentration was Language and International Business scored 4.23.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Spanish business concepts and context**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**M 9: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Spanish majors whose concentration was literature scored 5.32.

**Target for O1: Understanding spoken Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O2: Ability to teach Spanish language and cultures**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O4: Speaking Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O5: Reading Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

**Target for O6: Writing in Spanish**

Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.
Target for O7: Knowledge of the culture of hispanophone countries
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Target for O8: Knowledge of literatures in the Spanish language
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

Target for O9: Oral proficiency
Target was 4 (student work was very good for the assignment.

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.

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 |
Critical Thinking through Writing
The Spanish section will implement their first CTW course in the fall of 2008. SPAN 3307: Introduction to Literary Texts is a required course for all majors and the CTW element will promote improvement in writing and reading.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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. Culture, listening, reading, and writing scores rose slightly from 2006-2007. Even though the score on literature is a little lower it surpasses the 4.0 goal.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The Spanish section will attempt to improve all scores with the implementation of their first Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course which will encourage process writing and more revisions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Spanish MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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 future professional practices (integration). 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.

**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.
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.

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.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Speech BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### 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
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### 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
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

#### 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
- 2 Oral Communication

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89% of students in Spch 3010 earned a grade of 70% or better on a technical speech presentation. Data was not collected via the Competent Communicator Scale rubric. In a different course, spch 3210, 91% of students earned a score of 70% or higher on the competent communicator scale rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: critical skills**
A grade of 70 out of 100 on the exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61% of the students in Spch 4450 earned 70% for the grade on their final paper; no data was collected using the writing instrument rubric. In Spch 4400, 74% of the students earned 70% (or higher) for the grade on the paper, and 74% of the students earned 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61% of the students in Spch 4450 earned 70% for the grade on their final paper; no data was collected using the writing instrument rubric. In Spch 4400, 74% of the students earned 70% (or higher) for the grade on the paper, and 74% of the students earned 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
91% of the students in Spch 4400 earned a grade of 70% or better on the observation.

Target for O2: critical skills
a grade of 70 out of 100 on the observation

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
91% of the students in Spch 4400 earned a grade of 70% or better 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.

Target for O1: processes, theories, and research
a grade of 70/100 on the group project

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students earned 70% or higher on the assignment.

Target for O2: critical skills
a grade of 70/100 on the group project

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students earned 70% or higher on the assignment.

Target for O3: leadership competencies
a grade of 70/100 on the group project

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students earned 70% or higher on the assignment.

M 7: online and in class assessments in Speech 1000 (O: 4)
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.

Target for O4: Oral Communication in the core
Improvement over 2005-2006 scores

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

exam revision
Several actions are required. First, the assessment exam may not be testing what is actually taught in the major courses and thus will be revised by the speech faculty. Second, the assessment exam tests information taught in courses currently not required of ALL majors. Questions will be added to the exam to determine what courses students have already taken, but more importantly, the faculty will continue their discussion to revise the curriculum of the speech major. Finally, these curriculum revisions will require continued discussion about the appropriateness of the current goals and objectives for the speech major.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: exam | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research
Implementation Description: Fall semester 06
Responsible Person/Group: Speech Communication faculty

implement CCS
Instructors will be directed to complete the Competent Communicator Scale for all future presentations used for assessment

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: speech presentation | Outcome/Objective: leadership competencies
**Implement writing instrument**
Instructors will be directed to complete the writing assessment instrument for all future papers used for assessment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: critical skills

- **Implementation Description:** Fall semester 06
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors of Spch 3210, Business and Professional Communication

**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: course exam | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech 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: research paper | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories, and research

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 07
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty

**Consistency with oral delivery rubric**
Instructors this past year either did not include information from this competent communicator rubric OR the actual speech grade. The rubric receives robust support from the National Communication Association and the GSU speech faculty; therefore, the faculty agreed this component should be included in future assessment reports. In addition, speech grades will also be included in future assessment reports.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 08
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech area faculty

**Consistency with writing rubric**
Instructors completed their grades and the writing assessment rubric for student papers. There seemed to be a discrepancy between grades on these papers and the writing assessment rubric, and this discrepancy is consistent across courses. The speech faculty determined that this variance was to be expected and after reviewing the rubric, created by the English faculty, agreed to continue using this assessment measure. The speech faculty also agreed to use this assessment tool consistently; not all courses last year reported this information.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
### Devise new goals/objectives

As indicated in “Action 1,” the speech faculty is still discussing the speech major’s curriculum revisions, more specifically how those revisions impact the learning goals and objectives for the major. Once new goals and objectives have been established, a new assessment plan will be created. Assignments for our two CTW courses, Persuasion and Communication & Diversity, have been developed by the faculty to be used for assessment purposes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: critical skills | processes, theories, and research

**Implementation Description:** Spring 09  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Speech area faculty

### Eliminate exams as measures

Based on previous assessment data and faculty discussions, the assessment exams were eliminated for 2007-2008. This elimination may be temporary, while the speech curriculum is under revision. That revision process is nearly complete. Once the revision is complete and students enroll in the newly designed Area F, core classes, and CTW courses, the entire assessment plan will be revised accordingly – including a discussion of whether or not to reinstate an assessment exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: course exam | Outcome/Objective: critical skills | leadership competencies | processes, theories, and research

**Implementation Description:** Fall 08  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Speech area faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The Speech area faculty have completed a major revision of the curriculum. This assessment report is on the old curriculum, and two of its measures were eliminated because of this transition to the new curriculum. The faculty have agreed to be more consistent in their use of assessment measures in the future.

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

The Speech curriculum will be revised for the next academic year. Its assessment will no longer include exams. The faculty have found that some of the assessment measures, e.g. competent communicator rubric, were not consistently used in this academic year, but a concerted effort will be made to have all of the assessment measures consistently used for the new curriculum. There will be discussions about revising the goals/outcomes for the revised curriculum, and adding measures will also be discussed.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 Sports Administration MS**  
**As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST**  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**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...
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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Sport Law**

To understand and be familiar with legal aspects in sport business.

### Other 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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

### 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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### 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

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

### 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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**M 3: Evaluation of work experience in sport business (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Work experience in final credit hours, evaluated by specified professor in conjunction with the worksite supervisor. This evaluation will be conducted with an evaluation form developed by the faculty. The form contains a rating scale of 1 to 5 on appropriate areas such as “arrives to work on time,” and “performs duties assigned accurately and on time.” The form also contains a section in which the evaluator may write other information regarding the student’s performance.

**Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport**

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**Target for O2: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business**

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**Target for O4: Has work experience in sport business industry**

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**Target for O5: Can develop financial planning for sports**

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**Target for O6: Describes sport management functions**

85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.
**Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing**
85% of students will meet or exceed a passing grade (graded on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" scale) on the work experience course.

**M 4: Major Projects (O: 3, 7)**
The student will demonstrate conceptual understanding of unique aspects of sport business in major projects in courses. Each instructor will evaluate the projects with an emphasis on the accuracy of the application of course content to the project; organization of the project; and accuracy of research material used for the project.

**Target for O3: Can conduct sport business research**
80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.

**Target for O7: Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing**
80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher) on the major project.

**M 5: Papers (O: 1, 3, 4, 7)**
Papers in each course will be evaluated by the instructor of that course. Evaluation emphasis will be on writing skills, coverage and accuracy of the content, and accurate citation with review of literature. Evaluation will be of equal parts of each item.

**Target for O1: Understands socio-cultural context of sport**
80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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
- **Measure:** Evaluation of work experience in sport business | **Outcome/Objective:** 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:** 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 | Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business | Understands socio-cultural context of sport
- **Measure:** Papers | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research | Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing | 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

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brenda Pitts, Professor, Sport Administration; Andy Doyle, DeptChair, Interim Program Coordinator

**Additional Resources:** Faculty with expertise in the content areas of sport law, sport finance, organizational behavior in sport, and sport sociology; increased department support of resources for teaching and research.

**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 develop financial planning for sports
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

**Measure:** Papers | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research

| Demonstrates an understanding of sport marketing | Has work experience in sport business industry | Understands socio-cultural context of sport

**Measure:** Presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Can conduct sport business research

Implementation Description: September 1, 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brenda Pitts

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.

---

Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Sports Medicine MS**

As of 12/12/2016 03:13 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of students demonstrated 100% proficiency on the required modalities.

**M 2: Final Competency Exam (O: 1, 6)**

Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of curricular material.

**Target for O1: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**

90% of the students will demonstrate a 3.5/5 on the comprehensive examinations at the completion of their course work, prior to
## Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students demonstrated a 3.5/5 or better on the comprehensive exam prior to graduation

### 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

### 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

#### 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

### 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

### 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

### 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

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of students completed a challenging case study and demonstrated the required proficiency
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
90% of students completed a challenging case study and demonstrated the required proficiency

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. Increased use of case studies is assisting in the transfer of knowledge, as identified in last year’s weakness section, as students were beginning to demonstrate a difficulty in the transfer of knowledge. Greater use of case studies, and a modification of group case studies in single-pair-square method has strengthen core learning values. 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, however, the transfer, again was identified as a potential problem area last year. To resolve this, all clinical supervisors were met with on an individual basis this year to strengthen and enhance the learning models and ensure that as time has passed, that instruction in the classroom is still keeping pace with field-based experiences. Modifications have been made to insure that synchronous learning experiences are occurring, more supervision is occurring, and more guest lecturing experiences are infused into the curriculum.

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. The prior year’s attempt at peer tutoring and mentoring did not show any measurable change in outcome. However, spending the summer on undergraduate skill remediation to insure that students pass the NATA Exam with the allowable timeframe, with a financial incentive tied to passing the exam has proven to have more impact that peer-based programming. However, the summer remediation is time consuming for faculty, and pushes more graduate material into the fall courses, demanding greater degree of graduate mastery of concepts in a shorter period of time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Sports Science PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Recognizing that physical activity is vital for all people, the Department of Kinesiology and Health at Georgia State University seeks to: 1. Discover new knowledge and advance the understanding of the role of physical activity in attaining optimal health and well-being. 2. Educate members of society and prepare future professionals, and 3. Promote healthy lifestyles through life-long activity and learning. The Ph.D. major in Kinesiology is designed to prepare students for research and teaching careers at colleges and universities and for health, physiological performance, rehabilitative science, and related fields. Three concentration areas, Biomechanics, Exercise Physiology, and Physical Rehabilitative Science are available within this program.

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All doctoral students have passed statistics and research design/methods 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the doctoral students (n=4) that sat for their exams, passed their exams. Two of the four doctoral candidates successfully defended their dissertations; the other two students are either working on their dissertation proposal or collecting their dissertation data.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All doctoral candidates (n=4) presented research papers at professional conferences prior to their comprehensive exams. 2 out of 4 doctoral students (non-candidates) have presented research at professional conferences. One student received a research award.

**Target for O5: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers**
That 100% of students complete this requirement

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All doctoral candidates (n=4) presented research papers at professional conferences prior to their comprehensive exams. 2 out of 4 doctoral students (non-candidates) have presented research at professional conferences. One student received a research award.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All doctoral students completed seminars and/or grant proposals.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
6 out of 8 doctoral students have completed the cognate portion of their doctoral program; the other two students are in the process of completing their cognate.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Doctoral students are exposed to multi-cultural perspectives in their coursework, class projects, and/or research.

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

#### Enhance research component to program
Faculty mentor students on research projects to insure they develop the research skills needed to complete research

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

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Pass statistics and research methods tests | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
- Measure: 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

Annual review of doctoral students
Kinesiology faculty members will meet once in the late Spring (or early summer) semester to review the progress of their doctoral students toward course, residency, and research completion.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 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
  Measure: Refereed scientific papers at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
  Measure: Successful completion of seminars | Outcome/Objective: Develop grant writing and management skills
Implementation Description: Summer 2009
Projected Completion Date: 04/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Kinesiology faculty

Revise Outcome and Related Measures
Revise Outcome and Related Measures of the PhD Kinesiology LOA
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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: 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
  Measure: Refereed scientific papers at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Develop an understanding of research
  Measure: Successful completion of seminars | Outcome/Objective: Develop grant writing and management skills
Implementation Description: Summer 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Ingalls

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives? Review and analysis of the LOAs indicated that students are successful in developing research skills and knowledge needed for the successful presentation of research and degree completion.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Outcomes/objectives need to be re-defined.

---
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**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**

3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
2 Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

6. Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

5. Contemporary Issues
Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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

5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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 arts
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

7 Technology

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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

5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Historical Knowledge (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of broad factors that influence art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Multi-cultural awareness (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicates an awareness of the diversity of cultural influences and cultural histories in the visual arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Professional Preparation in the Arts (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge relating to professional practices in the visual arts as demonstrated in artist’s statement, professional resume and portfolio presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written essay submitted that details information about the student’s portfolio of art and why the student has chosen this art discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication**
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 82 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-7%, 2-14%, 3-26%, 4-24%, 5-25%, 6-4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 82 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-3%, 2-8%, 3-11%, 4-24%, 5-14%, 6-9%, and 31% was not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: BFA Art Exhibition (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group art exhibition of artwork by all BFA candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-3%, 3-13%, 4-17%, 5-47%, 6-8% and 12% not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Quantitative Skills**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 82 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-4%, 2-12%, 3-26%, 4-27%, 5-27%, 6-4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Interdisciplinary Knowledge**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-2%, 3-17%, 4-25%, 5-34%, 6-22%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950 submitted on CD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Technology**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-2%, 3-18%, 4-34%, 5-23%, 6-23%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Multi-cultural awareness**

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-15%, 3-15%, 4-33%, 5-35%, 6-10% and 2% not applicable.

M 8: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 10)
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

Target for O10: Health and Safety
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-3%, 4-22%, 5-41%, 6-15%, and 19% not applicable.

M 9: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 11)
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-2%, 3-14%, 4-20%, 5-43%, 6-19%.

M 10: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 4)
Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

Target for O4: Analytical Skills
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 82 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-5%, 2-14%, 3-33%, 4-19%, 5-25%, 6-3%, and 1% was not applicable.

M 11: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 2)
Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 82 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-7%, 2-12%, 3-24%, 4-31%, 5-19%, 6-7%.

M 12: Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork (O: 7)
Portfolio submitted that includes 15 - 20 examples of work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950.

Target for O7: Technical Skill
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-21%, 4-21%, 5-41%, 6-26%.

M 13: Senior Level Final Artist Statement (O: 12)
Senior level artist’s statement submitted with final portfolio as evidence of knowledge and understanding of ones own artistic practice and competence in writing and communication skills.

Target for O12: Historical Knowledge
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.
Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met

Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-3%, 3-12%, 4-29%, 5-24%, 6-15% and 17% not applicable.

M 14: Professional Resume (O: 14)

Professional artist resume submitted.

Target for O14: Professional Preparation in the Arts

Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The minimum score goal is 4. The target score goal of 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target:

Of the 60 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-12%, 4-23%, 5-35%, 6-27% and 3% not applicable.

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: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Art Exhibition</td>
<td>Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Art Exhibition</td>
<td>Collaborative/ Group Skills - Senior Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Artist Statement</td>
<td>Historical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Artist Statement</td>
<td>Historical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description:

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork on CD</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Early Spring 2007

Responsible Person/Group: Assoc. Director C. Thalken and faculty representatives of all studio disciplines

Additional Resources: As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after meeting.

Undergrad 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: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Final Portfolio of Artwork</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Undergrad Program Review Committee

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 and faculty have approved a new course for foundations BFA students entitled Art 1050: Foundations Seminar. 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: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2008

Responsible Person/Group: Undergrad Program Review Committee

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 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: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork</td>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
New course development: ART 1050 Introductory Studio
The new foundation course ART 1050 Introductory Studio is being developed to expose students at the foundation level to conceptually driven art making. The course will include collaborative group projects, working across media and applying critical thinking to writing, discussion and artmaking. This course must be completed prior to applying to a major and is a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) designated course. We anticipate that it will have significant impact on applicants to the major in terms of the current five measures: communication, analytical skills, critical thinking, collaborative work, and quantitative abilities.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
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: Spring 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Foundations Coordinator Timothy Flowers
Additional Resources: PTI and FTTT positions to cover instructional demand for additional courses

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment indicates a substantial growth in the technical skills acquired from the point of application to the studio art major to graduation from the major. Upon application to the program, 58% of the students achieve a score from very good (4) to outstanding (6). Upon completion of the program, 88% of the students achieve in this range. An objective of the program is to encourage collaborative work. Only 42% of the applicants to the major scored very good or above for collaboration, while 82% of graduating seniors students scored very good or above for the same.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
A new foundation course ART 1050 Introductory Studio (see Action Plan) is being developed to expose students at the foundation level to conceptually driven art making. The course will include collaborative group projects, working across media and applying critical thinking to writing and discussion among other areas of non-traditional creative explorations. This course must be completed prior to applying to a major. We anticipate seeing the results of this course in the scores on collaboration for studio art applicants post 2008.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Studio Art MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-10%, 4-40%, 5-50%, 6-0%.

M 2: Portfolio (O: 2)
Graduate final portfolio of artwork completed during final two years of program of study including thesis year work.

Target for O2: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-0%, 4-50%, 5-50%, 6-0%.

M 3: Thesis Paper (O: 5)
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

Target for O5: Advanced Research Skills
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-0%, 4-30%, 5-50%, 6-20%.

M 4: Thesis Paper (O: 4)
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

Target for O4: Communication
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-0%, 4-40%, 5-50%, 6-0%.

M 5: Professional Resume (O: 6)
Professional artist resume highlighting educational and professional accomplishments

Target for O6: Professional Skills
Scoring from 1 - 6. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1-0%, 2-0%, 3-10%, 4-40%, 5-50%, 6-20%.

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. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score goal is 5.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 10 students assessed, the following scores were achieved: 1=0%, 2=0%, 3=10%, 4=30%, 5=50%, 6=10%.

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

### Area Faculty/Committee Meetings

Area faculty will meet with Associate Director Conne Thalken as needed to discuss, devise and implement ways to improve.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
  - Research and Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
  - Communication

**Implementation Description:** Early Spring 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Assoc. Director C. Thalken and faculty representatives of all studio disciplines

**Additional Resources:** As yet undetermined. Will have better idea after faculty committee meeting.

### 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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
  - Research and Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
  - Communication

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director Kathy King and Graduate Faculty Committee, Recruitment and Retention Committee

### 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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
  - Research and Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
  - Communication

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director Kathy King in conjunction with Graduate Faculty of the School of Art and Design

### 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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
  - Research and Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
  - Communication

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director Kathy King working in tandem with Associate Director Constance Thalken
Graduate Program Review

The Graduate Faculty will convene to take the Graduate Program under a review in which the structure and curriculum of the entire program across all studio disciplines will be evaluated. The issues targeted for discussion are: greater cross disciplinary experience for students, creating interdisciplinary class offerings, co-teaching experiences for faculty, cross disciplinary studio critiques, and greater guest artist activity for studio visits and critiques.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Cross Disciplinary knowledge
- Measure: Research and Critical Thinking
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Advanced Research Skills
- Measure: Communication

Implementation Description: After the upcoming NASAD review in 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Professionalism and advanced research skills are the most highly achieved outcomes/objectives. The required solo thesis exhibition in our gallery combined with the year dedicated to working with a three member thesis committee largely accounts for this accomplishment.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Greater cross disciplinary and collaborative opportunities are needed in order to increase the scores of assessment in these areas as well as the area of critical thinking. Greater challenges in articulating critical thinking through writing and discussion can improve the scores in critical thinking and communication.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Taxation MTX
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Taxation (M.Tx) program offers a variety of courses that provide students with opportunities to develop research, technical, and communication skills that tax professionals need to excel in their careers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Program Objective (M: 3)
To develop ability to conduct research
Relevant Associations: AACSB

SLO 2: Program Objective (M: 4)
The student should be able to locate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

SLO 3: Program Objective (M: 5)
The student should be able to evaluate relevant authority for resolving tax issues.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

SLO 4: Program Objective (M: 1)
Students should be able to correctly interpret tax authorities and apply them in unfamiliar settings.
Relevant Associations: AACSB

SLO 5: Program Objective (M: 2)
Students should be able to communicate effectively in writing and orally.
Relevant Associations: AACSB
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Performance on exams or other assignments. (O: 4)
Performance on exams or other assignments in Taxation of Partnerships and Partners (Tx 8080) or Taxation of Corporations and Shareholders (Tx 8120).

Target for O4: Program Objective
Average score on each exam will be at least 70 percent.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
In Maymester 2007, the average scores on Exam I, Exam II, and the Final Exam were 79, 90, and 91 percent, respectively.

M 2: Effective Executive Communication (O: 5)
Performance in Effective Executive Communication (BCom 8250) or communication assignments in an 8000-level course.

Target for O5: Program Objective
Students completed 4 exercises requiring them to write both a tax brief and tax memorandum on a related set of facts.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The class average was 90.15 percent. This exceeds the target level of 80%.

M 3: Performance on projects in Tax Research (O: 1)
Performance on projects in Tax Research Tx8030).

Target for O1: Program Objective
Students in spring and summer semesters completed four exercises requiring them to identify tax issues related to a set of facts. Based on the initial year’s average performance, the target average score for the class is 70%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average scores for the classes were 76.78 and 77 percent.

M 4: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 2)
Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030)

Target for O2: Program Objective
Students in fall and spring semesters completed 20 exercises requiring them to formulate Boolean search requests to retrieve relevant cases and rulings for resolving specified tax issues. Based on the initial year of use, the target performance level is 50%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average scores for the classes were 56.35 and 53 percent. These scores were a decrease from the 64% average score last year but, nonetheless, above the target level of 50%.

M 5: Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030) (O: 3)
Performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030)

Target for O3: Program Objective
Students in fall and spring semesters completed 10 exercises requiring them to interpret tax law and reconcile conflicting provisions. Based on performance in the initial year, the target performance level is 75%.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
The average score for the classes were 79.9 and 80 percent. These scores were slightly below the 84% average from last year but still above the target.

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: Finished
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
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: 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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Based on the target score, technical skills (LOB #4) of students in M.Tx. program continue to be strong. Locating Authority (LOB 2) continues to be one of the more difficult skills for some students to learn. Given an average score just slightly above the target, the instructor gave students extra practice in electronic searching with ten in-class practice cases. Student reaction was very positive. They seemed to realize they must develop this skill to succeed at research. In Issue Identification (LOB #1) the exercises are very difficult. Most students have not received any prior training in identifying tax issues. This year's average score is slightly higher than last year's average score (75%) and provides solid evidence that students have learned this skill. In Evaluating Authority (LOB #3) average performance was consistent with the prior year. This suggests that the students are able to read, understand, and evaluate tax law.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Teaching & Learning EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Is committed to student learning and development (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators demonstrate commitment to students and their learning and/or development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator demonstrates responsibility for managing and monitoring student learning/development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Participates in profession’s learning communities (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator demonstrates how his/her personal growth is impacted through membership in one or more learning communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Increase Student Enrollment in Concentration (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program concentrations will work to increase the number of students enrolling in and successfully completing the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
100% of our candidates demonstrated expertise in their field and documented that they could apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

**M 6: Number of EDS completers (O: 6)**

This measure computes number of completers in the degree and by concentration as a way of monitoring faculty efforts toward recruitment and retention.

**Target for O6: Increase Student Enrollment in Concentration**

Increase of 25% over 2006-2007 completers overall and by concentration.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
06-07 07-08 Met EDSArt Education00N EDS - English Education01Y EDS Foreign Language 11N EDS Instructional Tech51N EDS - Library Media34Y EDS - Mathematics E26Y EDS-Middle Ch Ed61Y EDS-Reading Instruction21N EDS-Science Education41N EDS-Social Studies Ed23Y Total1919N Findings indicate the target performance was met in the following concentrations: English, Library Media, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, and Social Studies Education.

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

**Examination of Core Content and Delivery**

The Ed.S in Teaching and Learning has a core of courses taken by Ed.S students across concentrations. Faculty in the varying
concentrations have expressed interest in a re-examination of the content of these courses in light of the recent move in the state to GPS and a desire to move to an e-portfolio system. There is an interest in also offering these courses in an online version. A restructuring of this content has the potential to address all objectives and to be assessed through all measures.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT division chairs will facilitate this discussion.

Increase Data Collection within All Concentrations
Some concentrations have not yet implemented the assessment system. In 2006-2007 efforts will be made to assess all Ed.S. students who are at the midpoints of their programs and who are program completers.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: Ed.S. Faculty: All Concentrations

Assessment System Implementation
A portfolio assessment system focusing on content knowledge, teaching performance, and impact on students was adopted in 2006-2007 by all concentrations. However, due to the small numbers of students in a program, some concentrations have had little opportunity to pilot the system. The implementation of this assessment system will continue to receive attention in 2006-2007.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: Division Chairs

Core Content and Delivery
The Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning has a core of courses taken by Ed.S. students across concentrations. Faculty wish to continue to explore the possibility of online or hybrid versions of these courses. A revision of this delivery model has potential of impacting all objectives and to be assessed through all measures.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT division chairs will facilitate this discussion.

Increase Publicity
Effort will be made to increase public awareness of program concentrations within the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning 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 for each concentration with a goal of increasing each by 25% over 2006-2007 levels.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty within Concentrations

Core Content and Delivery
Faculty have resequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses. Some concentrations have requested fully online options and this will be continued to be discussed. In addition, the possibility of incorporating the TSS endorsement as part of the Ed.s core will be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty within Concentrations

Core Content and Delivery
Faculty have resequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses. Some concentrations have requested fully online options and this will be continued to be discussed. In addition, the possibility of incorporating the TSS endorsement as part of the Ed.s core will be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty within Concentrations

Core Content and Delivery
Faculty have resequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses. Some concentrations have requested fully online options and this will be continued to be discussed. In addition, the possibility of incorporating the TSS endorsement as part of the Ed.s core will be considered.
Increase Recruitment and Retention
To increase enrollment in program, efforts will be made to revise the department website, increase program visibility through emails to listserves, and recruitment through our M.Ed graduates. In addition, orientation sessions will be offered to all new Ed.S students to help them successfully navigate the program and understand program requirements.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All completers met the target performance expectations for measures 1-5. Ed.S students demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, teaching performance, and ability to impact student achievement. They are engaged in professional growth and participate in learning communities.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The new measure related to program recruitment and retention showed mixed results, with some concentration showing an increase in numbers of completers but no overall increase for the degree. Some program concentrations do report an increase in applications resulting in more students in the pipeline, so it is possible that efforts this year may simply take more time to reach fruition.
The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 4: Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field (M: 4)
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### O/O 5: Demonstrate Knowledge in Cognate (M: 5)
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**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**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
- 4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
- 4.41 Fiscal accountability that connects performance and priorities to resources

**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**
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All Ph.D completers demonstrated research competence in at least one research paradigm, thus 100% met the target of a level 3.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

100% of the PhD completers developed an in-depth understanding of the social and psychological, historical, political, and economic influences that affect education today (level 3).

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All of the Ph.D candidates engaged in scholarship and created new knowledge in the major discipline; thus, 100% reached a level 3. This area was particularly strong with 10 of the 11 graduates achieving a level 4 or higher on this rating.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All of the Ph.D completers demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of their major field; with 100% reaching the target level or above. Ten of the eleven graduates reached a level 4 or above.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All of the Ph.D completers demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of a cognate associated with the major; thus 100% met at least a level 3 on the rating scale.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All Ph.D completers demonstrated a professional identity by his/her contribution to the community of scholars and educators; thus, 100% met a level 3 on this rating.
### 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the Ph.D candidates demonstrated leadership through teaching/professional development activities focusing on other educators within their profession; thus, 100% met at least a level 3 on this rating.

### 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 standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All Ph.D completers demonstrated at least a level 3 on the rating of their uses of technology; thus 100% understood and used technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

### 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:** High
- **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:** Demonstrates Knowledge in Cognate
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating of Knowledge Within Major Field | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Knowledge in Major Field
- **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
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 has the potential to impact all objectives/outcomes.

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

Add New Assessment Measure

In order to document the degree to which our programs are preparing research/scholars who draw on their degrees to become actively involved in academia or positions as researchers, a new measure is needed documenting the job titles/affiliations of our graduates.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
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?
Ph.D candidates in teaching and learning demonstrate a strong foundation in factors influencing education; in knowledge and scholarship in their major, research methodology, and cognate; and in technology. They are actively involved in their profession and in professional development of other educators.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The current assessments do not provide information regarding the degree to which graduates are accepting roles in education in which they use their degree to become active researchers/scholars in the field.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Urban Policy Studies BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
It is the mission of the Bachelor of Science in Urban Policy Studies (BS/UPS) degree program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to prepare students who understand the roles of cities as the sites of policy activity in all sectors of modern societies and have the knowledge and skills needed to understand a specialized policy area as it operates in relation to the broader urban environment. The faculty of the PAUS Department voted to discontinue the BS in Urban Policy Studies effective fall semester 2007. Students in the program are allowed to finish or to transfer to the BS in Public Policy degree program.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Field of urban Policy Studies (M: 1)
Students will be able to understand contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities (M: 2)**
Student will be able to describe important policy issues facing cities.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Urban Policy Writing Assignment (M: 3)**
Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Examine Political Processes and Institutions (M: 4)**
Students will examine the workings of political processes and institutions at the local level.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Define and Identify Market Failures (M: 5)**
Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Collective Action Issues and Solutions (M: 6)**
Students will be able to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Understand Urban Growth (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Describe Public Policy Process (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to describe the components of the public policy process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Analyze Public Policies (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to analyze how public policies are developed and implemented in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to define the major areas of U.S. public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 11: Frame Alternative Policy Options (M: 11)
Students will be able to frame alternative policy options in a substantive policy area.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 12: Understand Urban Policy Research Methods (M: 12)
Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to urban policy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 13: Ethics, Politics, and theory in Social Research (M: 13)
Students will be able to define the link between ethics, politics, and theory in social research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 14: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques (M: 14)
Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to use observational techniques in experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, unobtrusive research and evaluation research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 15: Write a Research Proposal (M: 15)
Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to write a research proposal.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 16: Quantitative Research Methods and Statistics (M: 16)**
Students will become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 17: Apply Introductory Statistical Techniques (M: 17)**
Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 18: Perform Basic Statistical Analysis (M: 18)**
Students will develop skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Faculty
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Field of Urban Policy Studies (O: 1)**
Students will be able to understand contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies.

**Target for O1: Field of 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 2007-2008** - **Target: Met**
Overall, 93.4% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this as measured by questions on the midterm examination.

**M 2: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities (O: 2)**
Student will be able to describe important policy issues facing cities.

**Target for O2: Describe Policy Issues Facing Cities**
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 2007-2008** - **Target: Met**
Overall, 92.2% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this on midterm and final examination questions.

**M 3: Urban Policy Writing Assignment (O: 3)**
Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment.

**Target for O3: Urban Policy Writing Assignment**
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.
Overall, 90.8% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this on their Policy Memorandum Assignments.

**M 4: Examine Political Processes and Institutions (O: 4)**

Students will examine the workings of political processes and institutions at the local level.

**Target for O4: Examine Political Processes and Institutions**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Overall, 83.3% of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by responses to examination questions.

**M 5: Define and Identify Market Failures (O: 5)**

Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

**Target for O5: Define and Identify Market Failures**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Overall, 83.3% of students demonstrated either full or partial mastery of this skill based on responses to examination questions.

**M 6: Collective Action Issues and Solutions (O: 6)**

Students will be able to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

**Target for O6: Collective Action Issues and Solutions**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Again, 83.4% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill based on answers to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 7: Understand Urban Growth (O: 7)**

Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

**Target for O7: Understand Urban Growth**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Overall, 83.4% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill based on responses to questions on examinations.

**M 8: Describe Public Policy Process (O: 8)**

Students will be able to describe the components of the public policy process.

**Target for O8: Describe 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 2007-2008 - Target: Not Met**

Overall, 97.5% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill based on responses to test questions.

**M 9: Analyze Public Policies (O: 9)**

Students will be able to analyze how public policies are developed and implemented in the U.S.

**Target for O9: Analyze Public Policies**

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill based on responses on the midterm and final examinations.

### M 10: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy (O: 10)
Students will be able to define the major areas of U.S. public policy.

**Target for O10: Define Areas of U.S. Public Policy**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 97.5% of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill based on answers to exam questions.

### M 11: Frame Alternative Policy Options (O: 11)
Students will be able to frame alternative policy options in a substantive policy area.

**Target for O11: Frame Alternative Policy Options**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 92.5% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by the content of their policy papers for the course.

### M 12: Understand Urban Policy Research Methods (O: 12)
Students will be able to understand scientific methods as applied to urban policy.

**Target for O12: Understand 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 96.8% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured on responses to examination questions.

### M 13: Ethics, Politics, and Theory in Social Research (O: 13)
Students will be able to define the link between ethics, politics, and theory in social research.

**Target for O13: Ethics, Politics, and Theory in Social Research**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 96.8% of students either partially or fully demonstrated this skill based on responses to examination questions.

### M 14: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques (O: 14)
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 O14: Demonstrate Various Research Techniques**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
Overall, 96.7% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by answers to midterm and final examination questions.

### M 15: Write a Research Proposal (O: 15)
Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to write a research proposal.

**Target for O15: Write a Research Proposal**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 93.6% of students demonstrated either partial or full mastery of this skill based on their final research design papers for the course.

**M 16: Quantitative Research Methods and Statistics (O: 16)**
Students will become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

**Target for O16: Quantitative Research Methods and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students (100%) were able to demonstrate either full or partial mastery of this skill based on answers to examination questions.

**M 17: Apply Introductory Statistical Techniques (O: 17)**
Students will learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**Target for O17: Apply Introductory Statistical Techniques**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students demonstrated either full or partial mastery of this skill as measured by responses to examination questions.

**M 18: Perform Basic Statistical Analysis (O: 18)**
Students will develop skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**Target for O18: Perform Basic Statistical Analysis**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students were able to demonstrate either full or partial mastery of this skill based on answers to exam questions.

### 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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** October 1, 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 the following months.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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/undergraduate requirements/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.

**Degree Program Discontinued**

No further action planned for this degree program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** Low

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The faculty decided that the emphasis of the BS program on urban policy issues was too narrow in focus and not consistent with the background and interests of the faculty in the Department.

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

In the future, the BS degree will focus on Public Policy, rather than urban policy. New core courses and revised concentrations will make this a more attractive degree program for students and is consistent with the majority of the faculty in the Department.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2007-2008 Urban Policy Studies MS**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

It is the mission of the Master of Science in Urban Policy Studies (MS/UPS) degree program of the Andrew School Young School of Policy Studies to prepare graduates for leadership roles in urban policy organizations and to provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to understand the urban policy environment and specialized policy areas within this context. This past year, the faculty voted to also discontinue this degree program, replacing the emphasis on Urban Policy with a new emphasis on Public Policy, effective fall 2009.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Urban Theory and Policy (M: 16)**

Describe major urban theories and the application of these theories to policies.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Understand Urban Context (M: 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Literature for Urban Policy Research (M: 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>History of Urban Planning (M: 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices (M: 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Models of Planning Processes (M: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basic Concepts of Statistics (M: 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Introductory Statistical Techniques (M: 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Basic Statistical Analysis (M: 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 2: Understand Urban Context (M: 17)**
Understand the urban context in which policy decisions are made.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

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

**SLO 3: Literature for Urban Policy Research (M: 1)**
Examine major sources of literature for urban policy research

**Institutional Priority Associations**
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

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

**SLO 4: History of Urban Planning (M: 2)**
Become acquainted with the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place.

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

**SLO 5: Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices (M: 3)**
Become familiar with important issues and techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.

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

**SLO 6: Models of Planning Processes (M: 4)**
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.

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

**SLO 7: Basic Concepts of Statistics (M: 5)**
Become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

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

**SLO 8: Introductory Statistical Techniques (M: 6)**
Learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

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

**SLO 9: Basic Statistical Analysis (M: 7)**
Develop skills is using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Applied Research Methods and Statistics (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Microeconomics (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn about market economy and the application of theories to current policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Legal and Political Framework of Microeconomics (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn the legal and political framework that underlies the market economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Microeconomics Tools of Government Intervention (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Understand Context of Local Governance (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand the context of local governance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Differentiate Types of Local Governments (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate among the roles of different types of local governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Know Principal Actors in Local Governance (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know the principal actors in local governance, including elected and appointed officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 17: Describe Contemporary Problems of Local Governance (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe some contemporary problems of local governance and possible approaches to solving these problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 18: Political Processes and Institutions (M: 18)
Students will be able to examine the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level.

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

#### SLO 19: Identify Market Failures (M: 19)
Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

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

#### SLO 20: Issues and Solutions for Collective Action (M: 20)
Students will learn to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

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

#### SLO 21: Urban Growth (M: 21)
Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

**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: 3)
Examine major sources of literature for urban policy research

**Target for O3: Literature for Urban Policy Research**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All students (100%) demonstrated a full mastery of this skill based on weekly papers and their final projects for the course.

#### M 2: History of Urban Planning (O: 4)
Become acquainted with the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place.

**Target for O4: History of Urban Planning**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by answers to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

#### M 3: Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices (O: 5)
Become familiar with important issues and techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.

**Target for O5: Issues and Techniques of Planning Practices**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 4: Models of Planning Processes (O: 6)**
Learn about several models of planning processes, including roles for professional planners and citizens, and consider their appropriateness under different circumstances, and their implications for outcomes.

**Target for O6: Models of Planning Processes**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 5: Statistics - Basic Concepts (O: 7)**
Become familiar with basic concepts concerning measures and data sets.

**Target for O7: Basic Concepts of 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, 84.3% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by their answers to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 6: Introductory Statistical Techniques (O: 8)**
Learn to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public administrators.

**Target for O8: Introductory Statistical Techniques**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, 84.3% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by their answers on tests.

**M 7: Basic Statistical Analysis (O: 9)**
Develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**Target for O9: Basic Statistical Analysis**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, 84.3% of students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by their performance on examinations.

**M 8: Applied Research Methods and Statistics (O: 10)**
Develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

**Target for O10: Applied Research Methods and 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 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**
Overall, 84.3% of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 9: Microeconomics (O: 11)**
Learn about market economy and the application of theories to current policy issues.

**Target for O11: Microeconomics**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
Overall, 96.1% of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Evaluation Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 10</td>
<td>Microeconomics - Legal and Political Framework (O: 12)</td>
<td>Learn the legal and political framework that underlies the market economy.</td>
<td>Met</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>M 11</td>
<td>Microeconomics - Tools of Government Intervention (O: 13)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Met</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>M 12</td>
<td>Understand Context of Local Governance (O: 14)</td>
<td>Understand the context of local governance.</td>
<td>Met</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>M 13</td>
<td>Differentiate Types of Local Governments (O: 15)</td>
<td>Differentiate among the roles of different types of local governments.</td>
<td>Met</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>M 14</td>
<td>Describe Contemporary Problems of Local Governance (O: 17)</td>
<td>Describe some contemporary problems of local governance and possible approaches to solving these problems.</td>
<td>Met</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>M 15</td>
<td>Know Principal Actors in Local Governance (O: 16)</td>
<td>Know the principal actors in local governance, including elected and appointed officials.</td>
<td>Met</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 16: Urban theory and policy (O: 1)**

Describe major urban theories and the application of these theories to policies.

**Target for O1: Urban Theory and Policy**

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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All students (100%) demonstrated a full mastery of this skill based on responses to examination questions and writing assignments.

**M 17: Understand urban context (O: 2)**

Understand the urban context in which policy decisions are made.

**Target for O2: Understand Urban Context**

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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All students fully demonstrated this skill as measured by answers on midterm and final exam questions.

**M 18: Political processes and institutions (O: 18)**

Students will be able to examine the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level.

**Target for O18: Political Processes and Institutions**

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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 19: Identify market failures (O: 19)**

Students will be able to define and identify market failures.

**Target for O19: Identify Market Failures**

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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 20: Issues and solutions for collective action (O: 20)**

Students will learn to analyze and identify the issues and solutions associated with collective action.

**Target for O20: Issues and Solutions for Collective Action**

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 2007-2008** - Target: Met

All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**M 21: Urban growth (O: 21)**

Students will be able to understand the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

**Target for O21: Urban Growth**
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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All of the students either fully or partially demonstrated this skill as measured by means of their responses to questions on the midterm and final examinations.

**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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** October 1, 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All PAUS Faculty

**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
- **Implementation Description:** March 1, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All PAUS Faculty

**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
- **Implementation Description:** November 1, 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PAUS Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

With declining student enrollment in the MS in Urban Policy Studies and the shift in faculty interest away from urban policy toward more broadly defined "public policy," this degree program was discontinued effective fall 2009.

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

Students admitted for the fall 2009 will be allowed to complete the degree or to change to the Master of Public Policy degree.
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

- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

### 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

- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### 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 Programs in Educational Leadership state that candidates demonstrate the ability to assess school culture using multiple methods and implement context-appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community (e.g. population, language, disability, gender, race and socio-economic) to improve school programs and culture.

### Institutional Priority Associations

- 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience
Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards core propositions state that teachers are committed to students and learning. They are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. The standards also state that teachers understand how students develop and learn recognizing the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice. Teachers have skill and experience in teaching specific content and are familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to specific content areas. The Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership standards state that candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to analyze the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on families, communities, children and learning.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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.) Students are graded on class participation (0-50pts) prepared, read assignments, know material, demonstrates authentic interest in subject matter, participates frequently; 39-44pts - prepared/read assignments, knows most of the material, demonstrates interest in the subject matter, participates frequently, (33-38pts)-semi-prepared, semi-read assignments, demonstrates uncommitted approach to subject matter and participates only 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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90 percent of the students earned 90-100 percent on their practicum projects and their presentations. Each of the students received opportunities at their schools to take on school-wide leadership activities.

**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 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

90 percent of the students earned 90-100 percent on their practicum projects and their presentations. Each of the students received opportunities at their schools to take on school-wide leadership activities.

**M 2: Course activities-papers, projects, presentations (O: 3)**

EPSF 7120 - Students are graded on interview papers (0-20pts.), peer-reviewed group presentations (0-25 pts.), position papers (0-35pts.), journals (0-20 points); EPEL 7410 - Students are graded on instructional supervision issue (issue paper -0-20 pts), issue paper presentation,(0- 20 pts.), mid-term exam -(0- 30 pts), 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/EPEL 7410/EPF 74500 - 80 - 90 percent of students score above above 80 pts.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

Approximately 75 percent of the students scored 80 percent or greater in these courses. The position of the courses in the program are being re-evaluated to see if the student’s results increase.

**M 3: Research project rubric (O: 2)**

These are applied courses and the assignments are action oriented. In EPRS 7910 - Students are graded on: research journal (20pts.), exam (20pts.), action research project (60 pts) (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”.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met**

90 percent of the students earned 90-100 percent on their practicum projects and their presentations. Each of the students received opportunities at their schools to take on school-wide leadership activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Students recognize and employ research methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 percent of the students will earn a grade at or above 80pts. in EPRS 7910 and they will earn an &quot;S&quot; in EPS 7990.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students perform well in this course. The professors provide scaffolding to the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4:</strong> Students understand approaches to learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will score at or above 80 points in both courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The students perform well in these courses. The professors provide scaffolding and explicit instructions. These courses are being re-evaluated for the coming years.

### 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

#### EPY 8250

Because of faculty transitioning, this course may be removed from the program of study for the UTL and replaced with the Sociology of Education.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Course activities- projects, presentations |
  **Outcome/Objective:** Students employ critical perspectives in education

**Implementation Description:** Fall, 2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty

#### EPEL 7680a and EPEL 7680b requirements

The requirements and assignments for EPEL 7680a and EPEL 7680b will be changed to support the roles required of school leaders. EPEL 7680a will focus on preparing student to use data analysis to support the school improvement process within their schools. EPEL 7680b will focus on developing and implementing action research in their schools.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Practicum Project Rubric, reading, presentations | Outcome/Objective: Students perform as change agents in schools
| Students recognize and employ research methods
Measure: Research project rubric | Outcome/Objective: Students recognize and employ research methods

Implementation Description: Fall 2010
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 assessments indicated that the program equips students to engage in critical inquiry and to accept the responsibility for creating the conditions in their classrooms and their schools for academic success. It helps students recognize that education is a complex endeavor that requires an understanding of social, cultural and theoretical foundations.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The UTL program needs to focus continued attention on helping the students recognize that research must guide their work and that to navigate the political landscape of school systems partnerships and collaboration are necessary.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
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. The mission of the Urban Teacher Leadership Masters of Science Degree Program (UTL) 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 provide leadership development in collaboration, reflective thinking, problem solving, urban education advocacy and action research.

Contributions to the Institution
The Urban Teacher Leadership Program (UTL) contributes to Georgia State University by its creating a dynamic, intellectual environment that stimulates scholarly activity, it provides global, cultural perspectives and it is a distinctive education due to the program’s urban focus and the university being in the urban center of international commerce, media and government of the state.

Highlights
The highlights of the UTL program include the expertise of the professors who teach in the program, the collegiality formed by a cohort program and the Sources of Urban Educational Excellence Conference hosted annually to highlight the students’ research and leadership projects.

Challenges
One challenge for the UTL continues to be increasing the number of students enrolled in the program. Another challenge is that as PSC changes the requirements for leadership, the UTL must transform to best fit the needs of the graduate students seeking leadership certification.

Teaching Activities
The teaching activities in the courses included: research papers, professional presentations, review of scholarly articles, field experiences and community and educational leaders’ visits to classes.

Research and Scholarly Activities
Each student is required to conduct action research studies. Some of the UTL students are fortunate to secure graduate research assistantships (GRA) with professors in the college and especially in the EPS department. These GRA positions allow the UTL students the opportunity to conduct research and to help author scholarly articles or book chapters.

Public/Community Service
The students in the UTL participate in service-learning projects in homeless shelters, juvenile court and in their schools and communities throughout the coursework in the UTL program.

International Activities
Some students matriculate in EPEL 7410, EPEL 7000 and EPEL 7450 in the international studies abroad trip to England during the summer. In that way, they are afforded the opportunity to compare schools in England to their school in Atlanta, Georgia.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Women’s Studies Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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: Critical reading and writing (M: 1)
Students will read and write critically and carefully, as well as interpret and challenge interdisciplinary work.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 2: Connect to lived experience (M: 1)
Students will connect what they learn with lived experience.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Use writing conventions (M: 1)
Students will effectively use appropriate writing conventions and formats.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3)
Examinations, based on take-home essay examinations, from Introduction to Women`s Studies courses.

**Target for O1: Critical reading and writing**
We would like all students to receive at least a 3 on the rubrics, with 70% achieving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The undergraduate committee for Women`s Studies scored a random sample of WSt 2010 examinations on a 3 part rubric: 1) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge, 2) Developed and well-argued response to questions, and 3) clear and coherent expression of ideas. On rubric 1, theoretical knowledge, students averaged 1.7. All students achieved at least a 3, and 89% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 2, students averaged 2.3. All students achieved at least a 3, and 77% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 3, clear and coherent writing, students averaged a 1.9. All students received at least a 3, and 77% received a 1 or 2. Therefore, we actually met our target level achievement. However, our rubric does not adequately measure outcome 3, connecting knowledge to lived experience, so we will strengthen our assessment of that outcome.

**Target for O2: Connect to lived experience**
We would like all students to receive at least a 3 on the rubrics, with 70% achieving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**
The undergraduate committee for Women`s Studies scored a random sample of WSt 2010 examinations on a 3 part rubric: 1) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge, 2) Developed and well-argued response to questions, and 3) clear and coherent expression of ideas. On rubric 1, theoretical knowledge, students averaged 1.7. All students achieved at least a 3, and 89% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 2, students averaged 2.3. All students achieved at least a 3, and 77% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 3, clear and coherent writing, students averaged a 1.9. All students received at least a 3, and 77% received a 1 or 2. Therefore, we actually met our target level achievement. However, our rubric does not adequately measure outcome 3, connecting knowledge to lived experience, so we will strengthen our assessment of that outcome.
**Target for O3: Use writing conventions**

We would like all students to receive at least a 3 on the rubrics, with 70% achieving a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

The undergraduate committee for Women’s Studies scored a random sample of WSt 2010 examinations on a 3 part rubric: 1) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge, 2) Developed and well-argued response to questions, and 3) clear and coherent expression of ideas. On rubric 1, theoretical knowledge, students averaged 1.7. All students achieved at least a 3, and 89% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 2, students averaged 2.3. All students achieved at least a 3, and 77% achieved a 1 or 2. On rubric 3, clear and coherent writing, students averaged a 1.9. All students received at least a 3, and 77% received a 1 or 2. Therefore, we actually met our target level achievement. However, our rubric does not adequately measure outcome 3, connecting knowledge to lived experience, so we will strengthen our assessment of that outcome.

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

**Add additional measures**

In the current cycle, we measured writing skills utilizing only examinations; for next year’s cycle, we will also collect papers, both personal narrative and analytic, to use in our assessment.

- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Fall 2008-Spring 2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies
- Additional Resources: I will need the cooperation of the core faculty in order to properly collect these assessments.

**Add additional rubric**

Add an additional rubric that will more directly target the outcome, students will connect what they learn with lived experience.

- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Fall 2008-Spring 2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies and Committee

**Increase writing instruction**

In order to increase student writing skills, we should spend more time discussing the specific mechanics of writing, emphasizing development and evidence.

- Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Fall 2008-Spring 2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Our biggest challenge in assessing our progress is that we did not have a separate category for Women’s Studies Assessment of Core last year. As such, we do not have much to compare from last year to this year; last year, we collected research papers, and this year, we collected final exams. Interestingly, though, we are finding clear parallels between the strengths of the program in the upper levels and strengths in the core. For instance, students seem to score highest (average 1.7) on the rubric "demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge," and they seem to have the most difficulty (average 2.3 on a 1-5 scale where 1 is highest) on the rubric that measures their ability to develop an argument thoroughly and provide sufficient evidence. These findings suggest that our writing instruction is proving useful, although we could probably still systematize our writing instruction more carefully.

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

Our biggest challenge in assessing our progress is that we did not have a separate category for Women’s Studies Assessment of Core last year. As such, our biggest difficulty involved lack of proper collection of measures to assess certain objectives, such as documenting the connection between what students learn and lived experiences. Many 2010 classes involve the writing of personal narrative, so it is not that students are not performing this work; rather, it is that were unprepared to assess that objective clearly. Through systematizing our collection of assessments and developing additional rubric(s), we should easily be able to devote adequate attention to this outcome. Moreover, we should collect additional papers as well as the exams for WSt 2010. That will allow us additional materials to strengthen our assessment. What we have found in doing the assessment this year is that, in terms of the core, most of our need for improvement involves assessment techniques, rather than student learning.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Executive Summary**

Our 2010 classes are well-enrolled and we are continuing to refine and meet our learning outcomes goals.

**Contributions to the Institution**
Successful 2010 classes, including one in the FLC, Gender, Youth Cultures, and Identity.

**Highlights**
above

**Challenges**
Continuing to improve our successful completion of our learning outcomes.

**Teaching Activities**
N/A

**Research and Scholarly Activities**
N/A

**Public/Community Service**
N/A

**International Activities**
N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2007-2008 Womens Studies BA**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST*

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

**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: Write an effective argument (M: 1, 2)**
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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (M: 1, 2)**
Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to use appropriate theoretical perspectives

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**SLO 3: Apply skills to particular project (M: 1)**
Apply interdisciplinary women's studies knowledge and skills to a particular project

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: Major papers (O: 1, 2, 3)
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 O1: Write an effective argument
All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
The undergraduate studies committee scored the papers on 4 rubrics: 1) Clear, focused thesis that suggests a new approach to research questions, 2) Sufficient and specific evidence, well-developed, organized, 3) Clearly written, and 4) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge. In terms of the first rubric, which corresponds to outcomes 1 and 3, students' average was 2.2. All students did receive at least a 3, with 92% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 2, which corresponds with outcome 2, the average was 2.5. All students did receive at least a 3, with 67% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 3, which corresponds to outcome 1, students averaged a 2.1 with all students receiving at least a 3 and 75% receiving a 1 or 2. As such, we came very close to our target performance level for this measure as well.

Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives
All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
The undergraduate studies committee scored the papers on 4 rubrics: 1) Clear, focused thesis that suggests a new approach to research questions, 2) Sufficient and specific evidence, well-developed, organized, 3) Clearly written, and 4) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge. In terms of the first rubric, which corresponds to outcomes 1 and 3, students' average was 2.2. All students did receive at least a 3, with 92% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 2, which corresponds with outcome 2, the average was 2.5. All students did receive at least a 3, with 67% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 3, which corresponds to outcome 1, students averaged a 2.1 with all students receiving at least a 3 and 75% receiving a 1 or 2. On rubric 4, which corresponds with outcome 2, students averaged a 2.2, with all students but 1 achieving at least a 3 and 75% receiving a 1 or 2. As such, we came very close to our target performance level for this measure as well.

Target for O3: Apply skills to particular project
All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
The undergraduate studies committee scored the papers on 4 rubrics: 1) Clear, focused thesis that suggests a new approach to research questions, 2) Sufficient and specific evidence, well-developed, organized, 3) Clearly written, and 4) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist theoretical knowledge. In terms of the first rubric, which corresponds to outcomes 1 and 3, students' average was 2.2. All students did receive at least a 3, with 92% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 2, which corresponds with outcome 2, the average was 2.5. All students did receive at least a 3, with 67% receiving a 1 or 2. Rubric 3, which corresponds to outcome 1, students averaged a 2.1 with all students receiving at least a 3 and 75% receiving a 1 or 2. On rubric 4, which corresponds with outcome 2, students averaged a 2.2, with all students but 1 achieving at least a 3 and 75% receiving a 1 or 2. As such, we came very close to our target performance level for this measure as well.

M 2: Examinations (O: 1, 2)
Examinations, based on short-answer essay questions, from two upper level courses: WSt 4790 and WSt 4810

Target for O1: Write an effective argument
All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
We scored the exams on 4 rubrics: 1) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist knowledge, 2) Developed and well-argued response to questions, and 3) Clear and coherent expression of ideas. The first rubric corresponds with outcome 2, and the second two rubrics correspond with outcome 1. On the first rubric, the average was a 1.75 (on a 5 point scale with one as best and 5 as worst) with 87.5% receiving a 1 or 2, so that our target goal was met for the outcome: demonstrates theoretical knowledge. On the second two rubrics, our averages were 2.2 on the rubric that measures development and 1.9 on the rubric that measures clear and coherent writing. One student in each category (the same student) received less than a 3, and the percentages of students receiving a 1 or 2 were 75% and 87.5 percent respectively. As such, we came quite close to our target performances, with the exception of that single student.

Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives
All students should receive at least a 3, with 70% receiving a 1 or 2.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Partially Met
We scored the exams on 4 rubrics: 1) Demonstrates and applies feminist/womanist knowledge, 2) Developed and well-argued response to questions, and 3) Clear and coherent expression of ideas. The first rubric corresponds with outcome 2, and the second two rubrics correspond with outcome 1. On the first rubric, the average was a 1.75 (on a 5 point scale with one as best and 5 as worst) with 87.5% receiving a 1 or 2, so that our target goal was met for the outcome: demonstrates theoretical knowledge. On the second two rubrics, our averages were 2.2 on the rubric that measures development and 1.9 on the rubric that measures clear and coherent writing. One student in each category (the same student) received less than a 3, and the percentages of students receiving a 1 or 2 were 75% and 87.5 percent respectively. As such, we came quite close to our target performances, with the exception of that single student.
**Assignment Re-selection**
Select more appropriate assignments to evaluate; in particular, we should increase the kinds of assignments we evaluate so we can take in the wide variety of pedagogical approaches within our faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
<td>Core faculty</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improve rubrics**
Consider implementing more explicit criteria to define rubrics for student assignments. To do so, we should collectively decide as a faculty what rubrics we would use to evaluate student assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
<td>Core faculty</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modify assessment**
Departmental Conversation about evaluators’ interpretations of measures and/or the measures themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
<td>Core faculty</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. We have managed to finish this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>05/2010</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective)</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major papers</td>
<td>Apply skills to particular project</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective)</th>
<th>Implementation Description</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Core faculty(Many of us teach WSt 3010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives
  | Write an effective argument
  | Write an effective argument
  Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Apply skills to particular project
  | Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives | Write an effective argument

Implementation Description: Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty

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, development, evidence, and proper citations.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Apply skills to particular project
  | Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives | Write an effective argument

Implementation Description: Fall 2008-Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty

Systematize assessment
In order to systematize the assessment more carefully, we should remind faculty that we will collect random samples of WSI major papers at the beginning and end of each semester.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives
  | Write an effective argument
  Measure: Major papers | Outcome/Objective: Apply skills to particular project
  | Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives | Write an effective argument

Implementation Description: Fall 2008-Spring 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In general, we are finding that we have been quite successful in meeting our target goals for the outcomes/objectives. We have not completely achieved our goals, but we are coming close. In particular, students are doing well in terms of the outcome -- demonstrates knowledge of appropriate feminist/womanist perspectives. In other words, students seem to be “getting” the intellectual concepts we are teaching in our classes. There has been improvement on this outcome since last year. The, primarily informal, strategy of increasing writing instruction also seems to be helping, although I think we can increase its benefit with more attention to this issue. It has been suggested that we increase the number of outcomes/objectives, specifically to include an oral component; however, we have been unable as of yet, as a faculty, to agree on this as a departmental goal. We will continue to have conversations about what we feel our important academic goals, as we thoughtfully consider this suggestion.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We are still finding that students perform better on the rubrics when we use examinations as the measure rather than papers. The main difficulty students seem to have is in developing their ideas thoroughly utilizing sufficient evidence. While our (mostly informal) attempts to include strengthened writing instruction seem to be helping, we could still work on this issue. In order to increase our progress, we will systematize our early intervention and writing instruction in classes in the upcoming year. Moreover, while our assessment process continues to improve, we can still systematize our collection and evaluation process.

Annual Report Section Responses
Executive Summary
Through events on campus, interdisciplinary teaching, and rigorous research, the WSI fulfills its mission of creating knowledge and skills in the areas of globalization and gender, sexuality studies, and social change leadership.
Contributions to the Institution

Highlights
(1) The publication of Amira Jarmakani`s book, listed below. (2)The success of the Women’s Studies Institute Speaker Series.

Challenges
ongoing recruitment of majors and minors

Teaching Activities
WSI FLC: Gender, Youth Cultures, and Identity.

Research and Scholarly Activities

Public/Community Service
Secular Perspectives, 2E8 October 16-November 13, 2007, and February 12-March 11, 2008. Sponsored by the Atlanta Women228s Foundation9E8s Faith, Feminism, and Philanthropy Project, Atlanta, GA.

International Activities

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2007-2008 Womens Studies MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:13 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Women's Studies proceeds from feminist perspectives that recognize the full humanity of everyone. These perspectives examine how able-bodiedness, age, class, ethnicity, nationality, race, and sexuality intersect with each other and with gender differently in different cultures and at different times. As the interdisciplinary practice of feminist scholarship, Women’s Studies interrogates and envisions alternatives to social structures, institutions, ideologies, relationships, and perceptions of gender in traditional academic disciplines.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Feminist/Womanist Theory (M: 1, 2)
Students will describe and evaluate major schools of feminist theory as well as the historical evolution of feminism as both critical thought and social movement; students will include womanism in these discussions.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

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 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students successfully passed the exam and/or completed passing revisions.

Target for O2: Globalization and Women
All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students successfully passed the exam and/or completed passing revisions.

Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements
All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met
All students successfully passed the exam and/or completed passing revisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students successfully passed the exam and/or completed passing revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students passing the exam or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

All students successfully passed the exam and/or completed passing revisions.

**M 2: Master’s Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students will complete an original study or scholarly paper of approximately 60pp in an area of women’s studies and successfully defend this paper before their thesis committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Feminist/Womanist Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One student successfully defended a thesis during the 2007-08 year, and 8 students have come very near and will likely defend in 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Globalization and Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One student successfully defended a thesis during the 2007-08 year, and 8 students have come very near and will likely defend in 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One student successfully defended a thesis during the 2007-08 year, and 8 students have come very near and will likely defend in 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One student successfully defended a thesis during the 2007-08 year, and 8 students have come very near and will likely defend in 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Original Research Project in Women’s Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2007-2008 - Target: Met**

One student successfully defended a thesis during the 2007-08 year, and 8 students have come very near and will likely defend in 2008-09.

**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.

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

**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.

Shepherding Students Through to Thesis Completion

Students who are post-thesis proposal defense will be carefully monitored to ensure timely progress towards thesis completion, defense, and graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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: 2008-09 Academic Year
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director - Layli Phillips
Additional Resources: N/A.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Our curriculum has become more integrated around our topical learning objectives (1, 2, 3, 4).

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
We need to raise the number of students who are completing their theses during any given academic year (learning objective 5).

Annual Report Section Responses

Executive Summary

Through events on campus, interdisciplinary teaching, and rigorous research, the WSI fulfills its mission of creating knowledge and skills in the areas of globalization and gender, sexuality studies, and social change leadership.

Contributions to the Institution

International Activities

Research and Scholarly Activities

Challenges

Teaching Activities

Public/Community Service

International Activities
for Gender Studies, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile, 2007-2008. Women’s Studies Institute, member unit of the Agreement of International Cooperation between the College of Arts and Sciences and the Universidad Nacional de C29rdoba, Argentina.