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.

Goals
G 1: Financial accounting and reporting and taxation
The required coursework in the accounting major will provide knowledge and understanding of financial accounting and reporting and taxation issues, with the ability to understand constraints, identify alternatives, develop conclusions, and cite the professional accounting literature in support of these decisions.

G 2: Information Systems
The required coursework in the accounting major provides the ability to recognize, utilize, select, and analyze both the information provided by systems and the systems in place in a variety of business structures and companies.

G 3: Managerial and Cost Accounting
The required coursework in the accounting major develops the expertise to determine how companies, gather, process, store and deliver information useful in decision making.

G 4: Audit and Assurance
The required coursework in the accounting major provides an in-depth understanding of the auditing and assurance process in a variety of organizational structures, and the regulatory compliance requirements.

G 5: Communication, interpersonal, ethical and computer skills
The required coursework in the accounting curriculum will develop students' verbal and written communication skills, interpersonal skills, ethical decision making skills and computer applications skills.

SLO 1: Technical Accounting Knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28)
Students demonstrate technical accounting knowledge and skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting.

SLO 2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27)
Students demonstrate analytical accounting knowledge and skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting.

**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. Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.2 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
   1.3 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.3 International Initiatives
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Translate bus. activ. into acctg. info. (O: 1, 2)**

Translate activities related to essential business processes into accounting information reflected in the accounting information system.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

65% of students need to correctly answer final exam questions related to this measure in ACCT 2101 and ACCT 2102.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure was 62%. In 9 of the 12 sub-measures the students are not meeting the target level of 65%.

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**

**M 2: Solve operating problems (O: 1)**

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

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

65% of students need to correctly answer final exam questions related to this measure in ACCT 2101 and ACCT 2102.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure was 65%. In 5 of the 10 sub-measures the students are not meeting the target level of 65%.

**M 3: Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info. (O: 2)**

Comprehend the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**

65% of students need to correctly answer final exam questions related to this measure in ACCT 2101 and ACCT 2102.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The percentage of students who correctly answered final exam questions related to this measure was 75%. In 3 of the 10 sub-measures the students are not meeting the target level of 65%.

**M 4: Interpret the financial impact of transactions (O: 2)**

Interpret the financial impact of transactions, including revenue recognition and capitalization concepts, and be able to complete each step of the accounting cycle

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**

A mean score of at least 75% on quiz and exam questions related to this measure in ACCT 4030.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean score on quiz and exam questions which tested this measure was 83%.

M 5: Perform basic calculations for key acctg. issues (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Perform basic calculations for several key accounting issues, including entries related to allowance accounts, inventory costing, and depreciation of fixed assets.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 75% on quiz and exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4030.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean score on quiz and exam questions which tested this measure was 78%.

M 6: Prepare the four basic financial statements (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 75% on quiz and exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4030.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean score on quiz and exam questions which tested this measure was 82%.

M 7: Develop performance measures (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation, and control of organizations' business processes.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4210.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean score on exam questions related to this measure was 80%.

M 8: Evaluate alternative costing systems (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems and methods by considering the unique context of specific product and service organizations.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4210.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exam questions related to this measure was 70%.

M 9: Structure and model business problems (O: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Structure and model business problems to evaluate alternatives, conduct sensitivity analysis on assumptions, and analyze outcomes to determine causes of variances.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4210.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
The mean score on exam questions related to this measure was 63%.

M 10: Query Databases (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For set 1, fall 2008 least-squares means adjusted for students' GPAs (74.3) were not significantly different than the average for fall 2007 and spring 2008 means (75.4), which is significantly above the target of 65.3 established fall 2005. For set 2, an
integrative exam encompassing all the learning outcomes (querying databases, designing business processes, designing databases, and evaluating internal control), fall 2008 least-squares means adjusted for students' GPAs (60.8) were statistically similar to the average for fall 2007 and spring 2008 means (62.2), which is the target level.

**M 11: Design Business Processes (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Design business processes and represent them with documentation tools.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
Equivalent to prior year performance on the 24-Seven part 1 case questions: 72.2

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Fall 2008 least-squares means adjusted for GPA (72.8) were not significantly different from fall 2007/spring 2008 means (72.2). Both years are based on dual use of text and audio versions of case conversations.

**M 12: Design and Implement Databases (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
Better than 2006-07 performance on BloomScape case questions (62.2)

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
For the integrative exam including the learning outcome of designing and implementing databases, fall 2008 least-squares means adjusted for student GPA (60.8) were not statistically different from fall 2008-spring 2008 means (62.2). This sustains the increase first obtained in 2006-07.

**M 13: Evaluate Internal Control (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks associated with information systems.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
2006-07 norm for the 24-Seven Part 2 case: 62.3

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Although not statistically different (p = 0.05) from the 2006-07 norm (62.3), fall 2008 least-squares means adjusted for GPA (58.3) were 4.0 percentage points lower than the norm. This is the second year of using the 24-Seven part 2 case for internal control evaluation.

**M 14: Identify Tax Issues (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4510.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 72%. 3 of the 15 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.

**M 15: Select and apply appropriate tax laws (O: 1)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4510.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 76%. 3 of the 25 sub-learning objectives was below the target average of 70%.

**M 16: Make investment decisions using the tax law (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A score of at least 70% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4510.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Based on objective type exam questions, the average across specific sub-learning objectives was 77%. All 11 sub-learning objectives were at or above the target average of 70%.

**M 17: Prepare a complete financial reporting system (O: 1)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Prepare a complete financial reporting system for investors and creditors using professional standards and judgment.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 70% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4110.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The average exam scores on this measure was 76%.

**M 18: Develop accounting methods for new situations (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Apply accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to develop accounting methods for new situations.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A mean score of at least 75% on case assignments in ACCT4110.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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: Make decisions using financial accounting info. (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Make financing, investment and operating decisions using financial accounting information.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A mean score of at least 70% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4110.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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: Identify audit stages (O: 1)**
Identify the stages of an audit and the tasks completed at each stage.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 89%.

**M 21: Identify audit risks and objectives (O: 2)**
Identify audit risks and objectives and the appropriate audit procedures to address the risks and objectives identified.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 41%.

**M 22: Evaluate audit evidence (O: 2)**
Evaluate the characteristics and appropriateness of audit evidence audit evidence
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**
A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 64%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 23: Evaluate internal controls (O: 2)**

Identify strong vs. weak internal controls; make recommendations to improve weak controls.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 83%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 24: Identify auditors’ responsibility (O: 1)**

Identify auditors’ responsibility on an audit engagement and determine whether the auditors fulfilled their responsibility.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 65%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 25: Identify the types of audit reports (O: 1)**

Identify the different types of audit reports and which audit report should be issued under specific circumstances.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4610.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average score on exam questions related to this measure was 67%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 26: Read and interpret the four financial statements (O: 1)**

Effectively read and interpret the four basic financial statements and use footnote data included in annual reports to analyze such items as accounts receivable, inventory, depreciable assets and operating leases.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4110.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 27: Perform basic financial statement analysis (O: 2)**

Perform the basic steps and calculations of financial statement analysis including vertical and horizontal analysis, ratio analysis, analysis of profitability, liquidity and solvency.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4110.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 28: Access other sources of financial information (O: 1)**

Access other 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: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Technical Accounting Knowledge**

A mean score of at least 75% on exam questions related to this measure in ACCT4110.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### ACCT 4310
Develop better thinking models to help students evaluate internal control.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

| Measure | Outcome/Objective | Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Evaluate Internal Control | Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills |

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

#### ACCT2101 and ACCT2102
In ACCT 2101 one of the most challenging aspects of the course has been our inability to get students to attend the teaching assistants’ office hours. Fewer than 5% of the students take advantage of this resource. For 2009-2010 we will change the name from “office hours” to “tutoring sessions” and make them more “user friendly” by including some mini-tutorials along with the more common question & answer format for office hours. The teaching assistants will also be required to post weekly to the discussion boards in the hopes of involving more acct 2101 students in critical thinking topics and tips for succeeding in the course. Finally, two more videos will be posted on iTunesU. The first experimental videos were posted in 2008/2009 and although only 21% of the students watched the videos, almost 80% said they were a good idea. Feedback from many students noted that the students were unaware of how to access the accounting videos on the GSU’s iTunesU site. We will try and remedy that issue by having a brief tutorial in class on navigating the iTunesU site and give the videos a second year to “catch on”. In ACCT2102, one of the challenges that we face in this course is getting more students to attend the Teaching Assistants’ office hours. In an average week, roughly 10% of students will attend office hours with one of the four teaching assistants. During 2009-2010, we are renaming the “office hours” to “tutoring sessions” and will incorporate mini-tutorials along with the more common question and answer format which we have traditionally used. Each Teaching Assistant will be required to post a minimum of three times weekly on the discussion board with the hope of involving more students in critical thinking topics and improving the utilization of the teaching assistants as a valuable course resource. Although the course digital tutors have wide acceptance among the students, these tutorials will be introduced during the beginning of the course. Last, additional practice problems will be incorporated into both the lecture and the homework that require the integration of multiple financial statements to solve the problem, with special focus on the cash flow chapter.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

| Measure | Outcome/Objective | Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info. | Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills |
| Translate bus. activ. into acctg. info. | Technical Accounting Knowledge |

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

#### ACCT2101 and ACCT2102
See Action Plan for Measure 1

#### ACCT2102 and ACCT2102
See Action Plan for Measure 1.

#### ACCT4210
We improved the assessment process by providing a standard set of questions to be included on exams in all sections effective Fall 08. The result of the new, standardized approach is that the question sets used for assessing learning objectives are not directly comparable to 07-08. Thus, changes in means may reflect more rigor in the questions (prior questions included subjective evaluations and partial credit). Going forward the standardization will allow us to better assess how changes to the program affect student performance. We adopted a new text beginning in Fall 2008 to return to a more traditional approach. We had tried a text that emphasized ambiguity; however, this hindered the students’ learning of technical concepts. We will focus in 09-10 on improving students’ abilities to model business problems and analyze causes of variances as student performance in these areas lags expectations. Instructors will devote more class time and develop additional assignments in these two areas in order to help students.

| Measure | Outcome/Objective | Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info. | Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills |

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

#### ACCT4210
Develop better thinking models to help students evaluate internal control.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

| Measure | Outcome/Objective | Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Evaluate Internal Control | Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills |

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The average score was 78%. 

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Technical Accounting Knowledge

**Measure:** Solve operating problems

**Outcome/Objective:** Technical Accounting Knowledge

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge

### Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

**Measure:** Comprehend the usefulness of acctg. info.

**Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Implemented in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Clark and Cathy Partridge
master these concepts.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

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

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Tim Mitchell

ACCT4210
See Action Plan for Measure 8

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Structure and model business problems | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Tim Mitchell

ACCT4510
Refine "ChrisNotes" pertaining to this measure. Spend more class on these measures.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Identify Tax Issues | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Make investment decisions using the tax law | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Tim Mitchell

Delete Course and Revise Curriculum
In ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Measures #26 and #27. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you dont 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 plan to eliminate ACCT4410 and replace it with an additional 3 credit class in financial accounting.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Perform basic financial statement analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Read and interpret the four financial statements | Outcome/Objective: Technical Accounting Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

Delete Course and Revise Curriculum
In ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Measures #26 and #27. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you dont 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 plan to eliminate ACCT4410 and replace it with an additional 3 credit class in financial accounting.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Perform basic financial statement analysis | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
### Revise Curriculum

Revise the undergraduate curriculum to add three more credits of Intermediate Accounting, so that the relevant material can be covered in class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Develop accounting methods for new situations | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
- **Measure:** Make decisions using financial accounting info. | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
- **Measure:** Perform basic financial statement analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Siva Nathan

### Revise Curriculum

See Action Plan for Measure 18

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Make decisions using financial accounting info. | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
- **Measure:** Perform basic financial statement analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Siva Nathan

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based on the results of the assessment data from 2007-08 and 2008-09 we have implemented a new undergraduate curriculum beginning Fall 2009. The new curriculum adds more financial accounting to the curriculum and eliminates the financial statement analysis course. There is a financial statement analysis course offered at the graduate level.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

Develop in graduates a high level of confidence 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.

### Goals

**G 1: Discipline knowledge - evaluate research**

Students should be able to critically evaluate and discuss theoretical developments and the results of original research.

**G 2: Discipline knowledge - conduct research**

Students should be able to conduct and present original research in collaboration with faculty.

**G 3: Research competence**

Students should be able to conduct original research individually.

**G 4: Placement**

Most graduates will accept positions at institutions where the research skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

**G 5: Teaching competency**

Develop a high level of competence in conducting university level teaching.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Comprehensive exams (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**SLO 2: Critical evaluation of research (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate research by providing comments to presenters at internal workshops.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**SLO 3: Collaborative research activity (G: 2) (M: 3)**
Students will conduct research with faculty in order to develop their research skills and experience with the publication process.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**SLO 4: Research presentations (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**SLO 5: Dissertation defense (G: 3) (M: 5)**
Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**SLO 6: Initial placements - research (G: 4) (M: 6)**
Students will accept positions at research institutions, preferably at schools offering doctoral degrees in accounting.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
2. Oral Communication

**SLO 7: Teaching - training (G: 5) (M: 7)**
Successful completion of 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
2. Oral Communication

**SLO 8: Teaching - competency (G: 5) (M: 8)**
Students will develop their teaching competency by teaching and obtaining feedback via SEIPs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
2. Oral Communication

**SLO 9: Placement - teaching (G: 5) (M: 9)**
Students will place in institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive exams (O: 1)**
Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Comprehensive exams
80% of students will pass comprehensive exams on their first attempt. Of those failing, 50% will pass on their second attempt.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Of students who have sat for the comprehensive exam in the past five years, 50% have passed on first attempt, 100% on second attempt.

M 2: Critical Analysis Seminar and workshops (O: 2)
All students in their first three years of the program will attend Critical Thinking Seminar to critically evaluate workshop papers. All students beyond the first year will provide comments to presenters during workshops.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Critical evaluation of research
All students in their first three years of the program will attend Critical Thinking Seminar to critically evaluate workshop papers. All students beyond the first year will provide comments to presenters during workshops.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All current students have taken Critical Thinking Seminar in each semester of their first years and have actively participated in critically evaluating papers. Workshops are monitored, and students are called on for comments if necessary.

M 3: Research with faculty (O: 3)
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O3: Collaborative research activity
All students will be pursuing a research paper with faculty member(s) by the end of their second year in the program. 50% of students will have published a research paper by the end of their program.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
75% (3 of 4) of students beyond the second year have at least one active research project with a faculty member. All second year students have an active mentored project that should develop to a collaborative one after completion of their 2nd year summer paper. 100% of students who have graduated in the past six years have had a published research paper at the time of graduation.

M 4: Research presentations (O: 4)
Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O4: Research presentations
All students beyond the second year will have presented their research at internal workshops. 50% of graduating students will have presented a research paper at a professional meeting.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All current students beyond the second year have presented their research at internal workshops. In order to institutionalize this target, students are now required to do a second year research paper, which they present to faculty in the Fall of their third year. 75% of students who have graduated in the past six years have presented at a professional meeting.

M 5: Dissertation Defense (O: 5)
Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O5: Dissertation defense
100% of students successfully defend their dissertations before a faculty committee; 75% on their first attempt.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students who have defended their dissertations in the past five years have successfully done so on their first attempt.

M 6: Initial placements - research (O: 6)
Students will accept positions at research institutions, preferably at schools offering doctoral degrees in accounting.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target for O6: Initial placements - research
At least 50% of graduating students will place at research institutions.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Of the graduates in the past six years, 75% have placed in research institutions (Carnegie classification) that offer PhDs in accounting. The remaining placement was at a master's level institution with research expectations (Carnegie classification).

M 7: Teaching - training (O: 7)
Successful completion of 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Teaching - training**
100% of students will take and pass 9200 within their first year in the program.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students who have entered the program in the past five years have taken and passed 9200 within their first year in the program.

**M 8: Teaching - competency (O: 8)**
Students will develop their teaching competency by teaching and obtaining feedback via SEIPs.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O8: Teaching - competency**
All students will teach starting with the first year in the program. All students will have a minimum average overall effectiveness of teaching rating of 4.0 on their SEIPs. 60% will have average ratings of at least 4.2.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students beyond the first year have taught; first year students are assigned to teach in the Summer of their first year. For 08-09, three of the seven (43%) students teaching at GSU fall below the minimum average rating of 4.0; Two of these have demonstrated the capability to meet this target by achieving ratings above 4.2 in at least one section. Only two students (29%) have an average rating of at least 4.2

**M 9: Placement - teaching (O: 9)**
Students will place in institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target for O9: Placement - teaching**
80% of students will place at institutions with AACSB accreditation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of graduates in the past six years, 100% have placed in AACSB accredited schools; 50% in separately - accredited accounting programs.

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

**Improve research collaboration**
We re-evaluated the first year summer paper requirement initiated for students admitted in 2006. For students admitted in 2008, they are required to read research in an area of interest under the guidance of a faculty mentor. However, they no longer need to submit a formal literature review. We feel eliminating the paper will allow students more time to focus on developing a research idea for their second summer paper requirement. Starting with students admitted in 2006, all students are required to complete a summer research project in their second year, including collecting and analyzing data and writing a working paper, with a presentation to the research faculty in the Fall semester of their third year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Research with faculty
- **Outcome/Objective:** Collaborative research activity

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester of 3rd year students entering after 2006.
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOA Doctoral Program Committee

**Improve Teaching Effectiveness**
SEIPs are currently being reviewed for each student. Any student who continually achieves ratings below 4.0 will be required to observe other faculty in the classroom as well as receive feedback from a faculty mentor. Students with average SEIPs below 4.2 will be encouraged to observe other faculty and receive feedback from a faculty mentor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Teaching - competency
- **Outcome/Objective:** Teaching - competency

**Implementation Description:** Beginning of the Fall 2010 semester
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** SOA Doctoral Program Committee

**Pass rate on comprehensive exams**
Students will be provided with formal feedback throughout their doctoral coursework regarding their strengths and weaknesses, with guidance for improving weaknesses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
GOALS

Mission / Purpose

BBA-AS PROGRAM MISSION: The BBA in Actuarial Science is designed to prepare students to: (1) Have a broader foundation of business courses and quantitative analytical training; (2) Have introductory-level knowledge on actuarial valuation of insurance liabilities and financial valuation of assets, integrating the actuarial contingencies and the time value of money; and (3) Pass the first two professional exams offered by the Society of Actuaries/Casualty Actuarial Society. 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.

Goals

G 1: Broader foundation and quant. analysis skills

Upon completion of the BBA-AS program, students will have a broader foundation of business courses and quantitative analytical training.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have made three changes to our PhD program since last year’s assessment report: 1. We have eliminated the first year summer paper requirement for students and replaced it with the requirement to read a stream of research under the mentorship of a faculty member. Student feedback indicated that the requirement to prepare a formal literature review caused them to focus too much on the deliverable and hampered the ability to follow research leads creatively. 2. We have instituted a formal feedback system. The PhD committee now seeks input from faculty regarding student performance, meets to formally discuss and summarize the feedback as a committee and then with each individual feedback to provide them with feedback. We also have a dialog with the student concerning their aspirations and suggestions for helping them to attain these aspirations. 3. We have instituted a tracking system for students’ teaching performance and will implement appropriate plans to help the student improve his/her teaching effectiveness.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This year’s findings suggest that there is variance across individual PhD student performance. The best students are passing their comprehensive exams on their initial attempts and are co-authoring with faculty. However, a greater proportion of students than desired are either failing their comprehensive exams on the first attempt and/or lagging in terms of research collaboration. We used this information to make two changes to our curriculum and program. First, we eliminated the first year summer paper as a requirement in order to allow students more time to focus on developing a research idea for their second summer paper requirement. We have maintained the second year summer research paper requirement as it allows the both the faculty and student to assess the student’s potential for performing high quality research as well as jump-starts the student’s research portfolio. Second, we instituted a formal feedback system to be conducted annually. This system allows the PhD program committee members to evaluate the combined assessments of all faculty members who have interacted with the student in order to evaluate the student’s chances of success in the program as well as suggest remedial action to the student where warranted. Our goal is to counsel students who we believe will not meet our standards to leave early their programs and to provide useful suggestions for improving performance to the remaining students.
G 2: Introductory-level actuarial science knowledge
Upon completion of the BBA-AS program, students will have introductory-level knowledge on actuarial valuation of insurance liabilities and financial valuation of assets, integrating the actuarial contingencies and the time value of money.

G 3: Pass the first two SOA/CAS professional exams
Upon completion of the BBA-AS program, students will pass the first two professional exams offered by the Society of Actuaries/Casualty Actuarial Society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Structure and solve problems (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
BBA-AS graduates will be able to structure and solve actuarial and related business problems with sound analytical techniques.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

SLO 2: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
BBA-AS graduates will be able to comprehend the theoretical and technical material in appropriate actuarial journals.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

SLO 3: Mastery of life contingencies (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
BBA-AS graduates will demonstrate the technical mastery of life contingencies and risk theory. The student will also demonstrate a mastery of actuarial modeling techniques.

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

SLO 4: Completion of first two actuarial exams (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)
To be recognized as a professional actuary, a person must become a member of the Society of Actuaries or the Casualty Actuarial Society by passing a series of examinations. By graduation, our BBA-AS students will have passed the first two professional exams: Exam P – Probability and Exam FM – Financial Economics.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Selected and Identified Quiz Questions in AS 4340 (O: 1, 2, 3)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected and identified quiz questions in AS 4340 Life Contingencies an understanding of the concepts of insurance liabilities, including “interest discounting” and “survival discounting” of actuarial valuation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Structure and solve problems
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O2: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.
Target for **O3**: Mastery of life contingencies

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 2: Selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for **O1**: Structure and solve problems

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for **O2**: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for **O3**: Mastery of life contingencies

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 3: Identified Exam Questions in AS 4230 (O: 3)**

Each student will demonstrate through performance on identified exam questions in AS 4230 Theory of Interest and understanding of the basic concept of compound theory of interest and the term structure of interest rates.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for **O3**: Mastery of life contingencies

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 4: Completion of first 2 professional actuarial exams (O: 4)**

BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two professional exams offered by the Society of Actuaries and the Casualty Actuarial Society: Exam P – Probability and Exam FM – Financial Economics.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for **O4**: Completion of first two actuarial exams

70% of our BBA-AS graduates will have taken and passed both Exam P – Probability and Exam FM – Financial Economics by the time they finish the program.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Explanation of technical concepts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3)**

The MAS graduate will be able to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**

The MAS graduate will have the basic conceptual knowledge and technical skill in evaluating major types of risks for a typical insurance company's investment portfolio.

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

**O/O 3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The MAS graduate will have the basic conceptual knowledge and technical skills in evaluating major types of risks for a typical insurance company's liability portfolio.

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

**O/O 4: Enterprise Risk and Integration (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3)**

The MAS graduate will have an appreciation of broader enterprise-wide risks and their integrations in insurance companies.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills
7. Technology

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Case studies from current events (AS 8810) (O: 2, 3)**

Each student will demonstrate through performance on case studies from current events in the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar an understanding of the following: (1) Concepts and tools in calculating market risks (stocks, real estate); (2) Concepts and tools in calculating credit risks (bond yield spreads, Credit Default Swaps, rating transition matrix); (3) Basic shapes of the yield curve and interest rate risk measures (duration and convexity); and (4) Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case studies from current events in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, 3 on Criterion 3, and 2 on Criterion 4. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 10%.
Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case studies from current events in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, 3 on Criterion 3, and 2 on Criterion 4. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 10%.

M 2: Case examples using real company balance sheets (O: 2, 3)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on a project and case studies in the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar an understanding of the following: (1) Concepts and tools in calculating market risks (stocks, real estate); (2) Concepts and tools in calculating credit risks (bond yield spreads, Credit Default Swaps, rating transition matrix); (3) Basic shapes of the yield curve and interest rate risk measures (duration and convexity); (4) Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies; and (5) Concepts and tools in calculating property-casualty loss reserves.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case examples using real company balance sheets in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, 3 on Criterion 3, 2 on Criterion 4, and 2 on Criterion 5. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 15%.

Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on case examples using real company balance sheets in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, 3 on Criterion 3, 2 on Criterion 4, and 2 on Criterion 5. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 15%.

M 3: Performance on project (AS 8810 Graduate Seminar) (O: 1, 3, 4)

Each student will demonstrate through performance on a project in the AS 8810 Graduate Seminar an understanding of the following: (1) Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies; (2) The regulatory environment, the role of rating agencies and investors; and (3) Different accounting (financial reporting) requirements (statutory, GAAP and fair value). Further, graduates will have the ability to explain technical concepts to non-actuarial associates or clients.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Explanation of technical concepts

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, and 2 on Criterion 3. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 10%.

Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, and 2 on Criterion 3. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 10%.

Target for O4: Enterprise Risk and Integration

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of student performances on a project in AS 8810 Graduate Seminar during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Achieved an average of 2 on Criterion 1, 2 on Criterion 2, and 2 on Criterion 3. The maximum failure (Score of 1) rate on any of the preceding criteria was 10%.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Continue retention of exams/projects**
Continue retention analysis of applicable selected student work until targeted 4-year database is achieved. Maintain rolling 4-year database thereafter.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Case examples using real company balance sheets | **Outcome/Objective:** Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation
- **Measure:** Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
- **Measure:** Case studies from current events (AS 8810) | **Outcome/Objective:** Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation
- **Measure:** Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
- **Measure:** Performance on project (AS 8810 Graduate Seminar) | **Outcome/Objective:** Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
- **Measure:** Enterprise Risk and Integration | Explanation of technical concepts

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang and MAS Assessment Group
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:** What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We have completely revised our learning outcomes assessment process, including the development of direct measures based on a standard rubric and stated set of criteria. Additionally, we have revised our data gathering process to ensure more accurate findings. We will expand retention analysis of applicable selected student work until targeted 4-year database is achieved. Maintain rolling 4-year database thereafter.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have completely revised our learning outcomes assessment process, including the development of direct measures based on a standard rubric and stated set of criteria. Additionally, we have revised our data gathering process to ensure more accurate findings. We will expand retention analysis of applicable selected student work until targeted 4-year database is achieved. Maintain rolling 4-year database thereafter.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:** What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Over the past two years, our MAS curriculum was revised to better serve our constituents. Implementation of these revisions began in the Fall of 2008. Our previous assessment plan became inadequate for analyzing the learning outcomes related to the revised curriculum. Likewise, most of the data gathered under the "old" plan is inadequate to assess outcomes of the revised plan. As a result of these changes, our data gathering process has now been revised to ensure more accurate findings in the future.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Communication (G: 1)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing.

**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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Analytic (G: 1)**
Students will be able to make connections between the African American experience and larger events

**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
- 1.12 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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 African American Studies BA**

(Assessment Data as of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Demonstrate logical reasoning**
To be able to develop a thesis argument based on a logical set of interrelated concepts.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate logical reasoning (M: 1)**
To be able to develop an argument based on a logical set of interrelated concepts

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
SLO 2: Demonstrate communication skills through writing (G: 1) (M: 1)

To be able to communicate ideas effectively through clearly written, well organized, and appropriately formatted scholarship

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Demonstrate knowledge of field (G: 1) (M: 1)

Demonstrate the ability acquire new knowledge and add to the body of knowledge in the field of African American Studies

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written Assignment (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students shall write a final paper in AAS 3975 (Theories and concepts) and AAS 4980 (Senior Seminar), on a topic that they will determine that is relevant to the class and approved by the professor. The paper is to utilize and apply key concepts in the course in order to demonstrate critical analysis and synthesis of a particular question relevant to African-American scholarship. Students are to demonstrate skills in critical thinking, clear communication, and acquisition of new knowledge. These skills include topic formulation, development, evidence of claims, clear writing, and appropriate grammar and syntax. A rating of excellent (5): Paper utilizes multiple categories of primary evidence to analyze the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. A rating of very good (4): Paper utilizes secondary data to analyze the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. A rating of good (3): Paper utilizes secondary data to analyze the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. A rating of fair (2): Paper provides a description of data, but fails to utilize data to analyze the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. A rate of poor (1): Paper reflects generalizations and does not utilize data to analyze the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Demonstrate logical reasoning**

Eighty percent (80%) of the papers will receive a rating of 3.0 on assessment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The final written assignment in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine student mastery of analytic reasoning. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 17 papers (AAS 4980 N=9 and AAS 3975 N=8) using the aforementioned 5 point scale. The outcome for AAS 4980 was met. The mean score was 3.67 with 88% of the papers receiving a rating of 3.0 or higher. The outcome for AAS 3975 was partially met. The mean score on analytic reasoning across all three raters was 3.35 with 75% of the papers being rated 3.0 or higher.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate communication skills through writing**

Eighty percent (80%) of the papers will receive a rating of 3.0 on communication.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

The final written assignment in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to assess student mastery of written communication skills, including use of grammar and syntax. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 17 papers (AAS 4980 N=9 and AAS 3975 N=8) using the aforementioned 5 point scale. The outcome for AAS 4980 was partially met. While the mean score was 3.16 only 66% of the papers met the criteria. The outcome for AAS 3975 was not met with a mean score of 2.86 and only 37% of the papers receiving a 3.0 or higher.
Target for **O3: Demonstrate knowledge of field**

Eighty percent (80%) of the papers will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The final written assignment in AAS 4980 Senior Seminar and AAS 3975 Concepts and Theories were examined by a three member assessment committee to determine student mastery on acquisition of knowledge. Members of the assessment committee examined a total of 17 papers (AAS 4980 N=9 and AAS 3975 N=8) using the aforementioned 5 point scale. The outcome for AAS 4980 was met with a mean score of 3.49 and 81% of the papers receiving a rating of 3 or above. The outcome for AAS 3975 was partially met with a mean score of 3.0 however, only 50% of papers met the criteria.

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

**Acquisition of knowledge**

This outcome is being met with graduating seniors (AAS 4980) but not students still matriculating at the junior level and below. Consider compartmentalizing the process of synthesizing information to create more manageable and sequential steps for students to follow.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Written Assignment
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of field
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** Unsure

**Analytic**

Overall, in analytic reasoning students are performing well with 88% and 75% meeting the achievement goal. Consider additional exercises to improve student performance in AAS 3975.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Written Assignment
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate logical reasoning
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee

**Communication skills**

This outcome is not being met well with lowest performance rate at 66% and 37% for both courses. Consider consulting with the English department to obtain recommendations on how best to improve student writing and grammar.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Written Assignment
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate communication skills through writing
- **Implementation Description:** May 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee
- **Additional Resources:** Unsure

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Theory and Application**

At the master's level, African American Studies contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging theoretical and applied inquiry by engaging in original research that examines ways in which ethnicity and racial identity affects historical, social, and cultural experiences of African-descended people. In so doing we prepare our students to engage in culturally relevant scholarship that improves the life circumstances of African-descended people.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 2: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students will be able to articulate verbally and writing emergent areas of research in the field of African American studies.

**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
- 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
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Analytic (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students will be able to systematically analyze and critique empirical research.

**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
- 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
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Research Proposal (O: 1, 2)

AAS 6010 teaches students how to critically analyze, synthesize, and deconstruct empirical literature to communicate orally and in writing the central tenets of a research problem/opportunity as it pertains to a social issue affecting the African American community. The primary assignment by which this outcome is assess is a research proposal.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Analytic**

Students will present an oral presentation of their proposed research using PowerPoint before a panel of three external reviewers who rate the presentation on a 100 scale where 100-90=Outstanding; 89-80=Very Good; 79-70=Average; 69 and below=Poor.

Benchmark: 75% of the students average scores of 80 or above across the panel of evaluators.

**Target for O2: Communication**

Students will be able to write in scholarly language: accurate, balanced, tentative, without conclusive/definitive statements, reflection of researcher's opinion, clichés, or hyperbole, etc. The oral presentation is conducted using PowerPoint before a panel of three external reviewers who rate the presentation on a 100 scale where 100-90=Outstanding; 89-80=Very Good; 79-70=Average; 69 and below=Poor.

Benchmark: 75% of the students average scores of 80 or above across the panel of evaluators.
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.

Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2: Biocultural evolution of humans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are expected to understand the linkages between human biology and culture in an evolutionary framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Critique of the race concept (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Biocultural evolution of humans (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Critique of the race concept (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Critique of the race concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was expected that students will score on average 80% on the essays based on previous uses of this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

A sample of 81 students from ANTH 1102 was investigated. The scores ranged between 75% and 100%, although three students did not turn-in the assignment, lowering the average to 78%. With the omission of the three students who neglected to pass-in the assignment, the average was 83% (n = 78). If the three students who scored a zero on the assignment are not counted, the targeted goal was achieved. However, the students that failed the assignment by nonparticipation must be taken into account. Therefore, the target was only partially met.
M 2: 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 was not required of students providing a check on grade inflation.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Biocultural evolution of humans

At least half of the students are expected to pass (70%) this extra-credit assignment.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

A sample of 75 students from Anth 1102 was included to evaluate this learning objective. The scores ranged from 3 to 10 out of 10 possible extra-credit points, with an average score of 4.9. Only 11 students out of the 75 (14.6%) received an 80% or better. However, this was an extra-credit assignment and several students (~25%) opted not to answer the extra-credit question at all. Because the assignment was not required of students, grade inflation was expected to be at an absolute minimum. The target was only partially met because only a quarter of the students sampled scored better than 70%.

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

Monitor and encourage students

Faculty will monitor and encourage students who fail to turn-in their assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critique of the race concept | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: The departmental learning outcomes committee will target the faculty who teach ANTH 1102.

Streamlining Instruction, Evaluation and Mentorship

- The faculty will move forward in developing and implementing streamlined rubrics for assessing student success in critiquing the race concept from a biological and cultural perspective.
- The faculty will continue discussing the possibility of a similar approach in the instruction of the biocultural evolution of humans.
- The faculty will monitor student performance.
- The faculty will mentor and encourage students to complete related assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critique of the race concept | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept

Projected Completion Date: 11/2010

Streamlining Instruction, Evaluation and Mentorship

- The faculty will move forward in developing and implementing streamlined rubrics on the critique of the race concept from a biological and cultural standpoint.
- The faculty will continue discussion on whether to implement a similar strategy for the teaching of biocultural evolution in humans.
- The faculty will monitor student performance.
- The faculty will mentor and encourage students to complete related assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Biocultural evolution of humans | Outcome/Objective: Biocultural evolution of humans
Measure: Critique of the race concept | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty took the learning outcomes process as an opportunity to discuss streamlining and unifying our approach to the teaching of the biocultural evolution of humans, and the critique of the race concept by expanding on the rubrics that were used in this year’s assessment. However, the rubrics used can be further improved and we will continue to refine them through discussion and experimentation as a department.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the
coming academic year? The department discussed using these rubrics in all the classes and agreed that in the future we will attempt to standardize the exercises related to critiquing the race concept. The department is still discussing whether we will standardize the rubric for the biocultural evolution of humans.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The department is pleased by the results of this assessment. The learning outcomes assessment served to inform the faculty of both student progress and challenges in the instruction of biocultural evolution in humans and the critique of the race concept, and focus awareness on the need for a unified, streamlined approach in these two critical areas. The faculty is deliberating a collaborative strategy for improving on our successes in these two key learning outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Anthropology BA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Goals**

**G 1: Analytical skills**
Students will learn analytical skills associated with the major.

**G 2: Critical thinking**
Students will cultivate critical thinking skills that pertain to the major.

**G 3: Communication skills**
Students will learn the communication skills necessary to succeed in the major.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge**
Students should learn fundamental concepts pertinent to the major.

**G 5: Application of Knowledge**
It is expected that students will learn appropriate ways of applying skills obtained in the major.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**O/O 2: Critical thinking (G: 2) (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-reflexivity; (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.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**O/O 3: Communication skills (G: 3) (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
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

O/O 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (G: 4) (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.

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

O/O 5: Application of knowledge (G: 5) (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.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Analytical skills
It was expected that the students would be scored as excellent or good in analytical skills.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The scores for analytical skills ranged from 1.1 to 1.4 (1 = excellent; 2 = good) which fulfills the expectations that were targeted. The students ranked rather well on the designing and implementing of research (1.1), and somewhat less well on identifying major themes in the literature, interpreting charts and graphs and utilizing information technology for research. However, the scores for these last three learning outcomes (1.4) in the analytical skills cluster are still closer to excellent than to good, suggesting slight improvement from last year in the area of identifying major themes in the literature (Table 1).

M 2: Critical thinking (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 2030), tests and take-home essays (Anth 4020) and final projects, exams 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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Critical thinking
The students were expected to be ranked between excellent and good for the acquisition of critical thinking skills.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The student scores range between 1.05 and 1.3 for the critical thinking skills cluster (Table 1). The students performed remarkably well in the area of mastering self-reflexivity and somewhat lower in interpreting causal relationships and critiquing the literature (1.3). The last of these learning outcomes was one that was targeted by the faculty in their courses and shows improving from last year.

M 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 answers/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. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Communication skills**

The students are expected to be scored as excellent or good for the achievement of anticipated communication skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The range of scores for the students ranged from 1.05 to 2 (1 = excellent; 2 = good) for communications skills. Students were ranked much more highly in expressing ideas in writing (1.05) and only good on collaborating on projects (2) (Table 1). While these scores show that the target was technically met, the score for collaborating on projects warrants further attention as it is the lowest ranked learning outcome and was ranked only "good" or worse by a majority of the faculty evaluators.

**M 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. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge**

The target for the acquisition of knowledge cluster is expected to be excellent given the learning outcome assessments from prior cycles.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

For the acquisition of knowledge cluster, the scores ranged from 1 to 1.2. The students ranked the highest for this cluster compared to the other four (Table 1). The demonstration of these learning outcomes is the essence of the major and is reflected in similar scores from past assessment cycles. The target was emphatically met for this cluster of learning outcomes.

**M 5: Application of knowledge (O: 5)**

Application of knowledge was assessed using laboratory assignments (Anth 2010), participant observation assignment, exams, short answers, in-class discussions and the final exam (Anth 2020), tests, class discussion and final projects (Anth 4020) and final projects and class discussions (Anth 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. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O5: Application of knowledge**

The target for the application of knowledge is for the students to be ranked as excellent or good.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The student scores for the application of knowledge cluster were excellent or close to excellent (1 to 1.3, where 1 = excellent and 2 = good) suggesting that students have demonstrated the potential to apply what they have learned in the classroom to real-world situations (Table 1). One of the hallmarks of the program is learning applications of the material and the ranks for these outcomes help to confirm this important emphasis of the major.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty will continue relying heavily on writing as an indicator of overall student success in analysis, critical thinking, communication and the acquisition and application of knowledge. We expect to maintain ongoing discussion among the faculty on successful strategies to enhance student success in these areas.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The faculty of the Department were pleased with the outcome of the assessment for this past cycle. A number of important discussions arose about the scores for each of the learning outcomes. These included comments pertaining to how students learn major themes and how to improve student writing capabilities. The CTW transition will certainly augment these potential problems and it will be of interest to the faculty to examine the results of the next cycle with the implementation of the CTW requirement.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The faculty have worked diligently to remedy the problems associated with prior assessments and this cycle is no different. Already this year the faculty have placed the learning outcomes on the agenda of two faculty meetings, and the topic was discussed at length at the recent departmental retreat. These discussions have focused on how the material is presented, expectations from students...
and general assessment procedures. The sharing of information among us vis-à-vis the learning outcomes has enhanced in a direct fashion the teaching and evaluation of students. Programmatic changes include the introduction of team-teaching in one of the CTW courses as a heuristic experiment. The results will be evaluated during the spring term and if deemed successful could inform decisions about modifying the curriculum. Although not directly associated with the learning outcomes per se, this experiment emerged from discussions of evaluation and assessment.

---
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**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Anthropology MA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Anthropology offers a Master of Arts in Anthropology. Graduate education in anthropology emphasizes research and teaching on urban contexts, processes, and populations. Students receive rigorous training in local, regional, and global transformations, quantitative and qualitative research methods, and theories of nature, society, and culture. In addition to intellectual maturity, students gain practical skills, including proposal writing, project development, field research, ethnographic needs-assessments, community development, and program evaluation. Graduate students are trained in theories, methods, topics, and skills within the discipline and each of its sub-fields. They are encouraged to write a thesis based on independent empirical research, or in collaboration with faculty. Alternatively, students may complete a practicum, in a variety of contexts and human service organizations. 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 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.

**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**

- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: MA comprehensive exam (O: 1)**

The graduate students are assessed individually by their committees, which consist of three regular university faculty members, two of whom must be Department faculty members. The comprehensive exam is tailored to each graduate student's interest and is written by the student's major advisor. The three questions include (1) the field of inquiry, (2) theory pertaining to the research, and (3) method to be employed in the research. The graduate students are asked to write 7-10 pages for each question, and to return the completed exam to each committee member within two weeks. The exam is then evaluated; the advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the exam as a pass, contingent pass or fail. The Anthropology Graduate Program Director was consulted to obtain data on the number students who took the comprehensive exam. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who took the comprehensive exam, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the exam on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the exam, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the comprehensive exam.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Comprehensive exams**

Between 80 to 90% of students are expected to pass the comprehensive exam the first time, and all of the students are anticipated to pass the exam upon the second trial.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

There were 25 students in the program during the AY 2008-09. A total of seven students were eligible to take their comprehensive exam during the year. Six students took the comprehensive exam and passed. One postponed the exam because she changed her topic in the third semester and did not have an IRB. A total of 85% of the students passed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt, meeting the target goal.
In their theses and practicum papers, students have to demonstrate 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 passing the defense with passing the defense, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the defense and graduated.

Target for O2: Thesis or practicum paper

A total of 80 to 90% of eligible MA students are expected to pass the thesis or practicum defense on the first attempt, and all of the students are expected to pass upon subsequent evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

A total of five MA students defended their thesis/practicum and graduated immediately; one had to defend it twice, but eventually passed and graduated. One of the students who graduated had to postpone her defense because the IRB approval process took 3 months during which she could not conduct her research. One student postponed graduation to fall 09 because she started her research too late. About 83% of students passed their defense upon the first attempt demonstrating that the target was indeed met.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty will continue emphasizing close collaboration, advising and monitoring of graduate students. In a faculty retreat, several structural changes to the program have been discussed, aiming at enhancing the graduate student experience, which also reframed the issue of appropriate measures and techniques of evaluating student success. Faculty surveys will be used to assess the quality of graduate student work.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The faculty increased individual advising efforts, mentorship and student monitoring in order to ensure strong performance and timely progress through the program, and the results of this cycle have been pleasing. The growth of the graduate program however will serve to further test the efficacy and sustainability of this method.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The faculty was pleased with the results of this year’s assessment, which show a high level of performance among the Department’s students with respect to the stated learning outcomes. The faculty is aware that the growth of the graduate program this year, and the growing demands of mentoring and advising will require close collaboration, knowledge sharing and sustained attention to ensure the consistent quality of graduate education. A number of possible changes in the structure of program requirements were discussed in faculty meetings and in a faculty retreat. There will also be ongoing discussion on optimizing evaluation and assessment.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Applied Linguistics BA
(Does not include those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE The B.A. in Applied Linguistics provides a thorough grounding in the study of language structure, use, and acquisition to prepare students for a variety of options for employment or further study in fields in which the scientific study of language is significant, e.g.: language teaching (including English as a second/foreign language), anthropology, speech and hearing science, psychology, cognitive science, lexicography, and text and discourse analysis.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Core areas of linguistics (M: 1)

Students demonstrate understanding of the core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax.

SLO 2: Foundations of language acquisition (M: 2)
Students demonstrate understanding of what is involved in the acquisition and development of language including its biological and social foundations.

**SLO 3: Key concepts in sociolinguistics (M: 3)**
Students will demonstrate their understanding of sociolinguistics, i.e., the study of variation in language form and use associated with social, situational, temporal, and geographic influences.

**SLO 4: Analysis of linguistic structure (M: 4)**
Students acquire the skills to analyze language structure (e.g., sound structure, word & sentence structures, discourse structure).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 5: Written Communication and Editing Skills (M: 5)**
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Final examinations in core courses (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 80% of students will score at least 70% on the final examinations in AL 3021 (Introduction to Linguistics), AL 4011 (Phonetics and Phonology), and AL 4012 (Morphology and Syntax)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Core areas of linguistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score at least 70% on the final examination in AL 3021.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>At least 80% of students scored at least 70% on the final exam in three out of the four sections of the course for which data is available (one instructor has not yet provided data).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Exam results in SLA (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance on final examination in AL 3041: Second Language Acquisition will be documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Foundations of language acquisition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 80% of students will score at least 70% on the final exam/project in AL 3041: Second Language Acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>100% of students scored at least 70% on their final projects in AL 3041.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Language in Society paper (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The final paper in AL 3031 is graded on a rubric that includes the following categories: (A) identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives; (B) shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem; (C) presents convincing arguments based on linguistic principles; (D) draws reasonable conclusions. The percentage of students scoring at least &quot;competent&quot; on these four areas will be tabulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Key concepts in sociolinguistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 80% of students will be judged &quot;competent&quot; or &quot;sophisticated&quot; on all four relevant criteria on the rubric.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>In 2008/09 95% of students met the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Performance on language analysis problems (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The final examinations in AL 4011 (Phonetics &amp; Phonology) and AL 4012 (Morphology &amp; Syntax) consist primarily of language analysis problems. The number of students scoring at least 70% on these examinations will be tabulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Analysis of linguistic structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will score at least 70% on the final examinations in AL 4011 and AL 4012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Partially Met</td>
<td>83% of students met the target in AL 4012 but only 73% met the target in AL 4011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Writing assignments in required courses (O: 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The final paper in AL 3031 (Language in Society) is rated on a 4 point rubric in five areas. One of these areas is &quot;presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.&quot; The number of students who score &quot;competent&quot; or &quot;sophisticated&quot; in this area will be tabulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for 05: Written Communication and Editing Skills**

At least 80% of students will score "competent" or "sophisticated" on the measure.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

In 2009 95% of students met the target.

**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
- **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 for incorporation of foundational and current publications in course readings. Findings will be reported in the next cycle.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

**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

**Changes to student learning outcomes and associated measures**

We are reconsidering our learning outcomes and associated measures as we are making program changes to the BA in Applied Linguistics. These program changes are currently under review and have not yet been implemented. We are working on the following: Outcome 2 & its related measure will need to be changed to reflect the fact that AL 3041 will no longer be a required course. Outcomes 1 & 4 need to be more explicitly differentiated. Outcomes will need to reflect two new required CTW courses: Language in Society and Communication across Cultures.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to work on our grading strategies, we are forming a committee to establish how we might implement more uniformity in grading across the program. This may include but not be limited to the development of rubrics to be used for CTW courses.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since last year’s assessment report we have changed out outcomes and their related measures.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Although we are meeting our goals, as a new BA program we want to continue to revisit our grading strategies.
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: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English (M: 4, 5)
Demonstrates knowledge of the linguistic systems of English phonology, grammar, and discourse

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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 2: Teaching methodology (M: 3, 4, 5, 7)
Applies the basic principles of ESL/EFL learning and teaching methodology

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Professional development (M: 1, 4, 8)
Conducts and participates in professional development activities

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 International Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 4: Technology (M: 2, 4, 5)**
Uses technology effectively in research and teaching

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 New Academic Programs (&amp; Modes of Delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 International Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 5: Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Communicates effectively in both written and oral language in English

**SLO 6: Connecting theory and practice (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Analyzes and critiques theory and practice of L2 teaching and learning

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</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 Recruit, retain &amp; graduate high quality graduates</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 Contribute to the greater community good</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 International Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 7: Cultural knowledge (M: 4, 5)**
Uses cultural knowledge in second language learning and teaching

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</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 Recruit, retain &amp; graduate high quality graduates</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 Contribute to the greater community good</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 International Initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Measures, Targets, and Findings

## M 1: Number of presentations/publications (O: 3)
Advisors count the number of conference presentations and/or publications for each student.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O3: Professional development**
50% of graduating students will have made at least one conference presentation or written at least one published article.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
8 out of 15 graduating students made at least one conference presentation or published an article.

## M 2: Oral presentation of Master’s paper (O: 4, 5)
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.

**Source of Evidence:** Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Technology**
90% of students will score “good” or “excellent” on their use of technology in presentations.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
94% of the students scored “good” or “excellent” on their use of technology in presentations.

**Target for O5: Communication**
90% of students will score “good” or “excellent” on the overall scores for their presentations.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
82% (14 out of 17) of the students scored “good” or “excellent” on the overall scores for their presentations.

## M 3: Teaching performance and videotapes (O: 2, 5)
Students are videotaped teaching a lesson to their peers in AL 8900: Practicum, a required course in the program. The instructor rates the students on a rubric evaluating teaching effectiveness (outcome 1) and oral communication (outcome 5).

**Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Teaching methodology**
90% of students will meet or exceed expectations for their videotaped teaching performance.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance for the outcome "teaching methodology".

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance for the outcome "communication".

## M 4: Survey of graduating students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students who graduated between Summer 2008 and Spring 2009 were asked to complete a web-based survey investigating their perceptions of how confident they feel about the areas covered in the learning outcomes.

**Source of Evidence:** Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "knowledge of linguistic systems of English".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
83% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "knowledge of linguistic systems of English".

**Target for O2: Teaching methodology**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "teaching methodology".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome...
“teaching methodology”.

**Target for O3: Professional development**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "professional development".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
83% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "professional development".

**Target for O4: Technology**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "technology".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "technology".

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "communication".

**Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "connecting theory and practice".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "connecting theory and practice".

**Target for O7: Cultural knowledge**
90% of graduating students will report confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "cultural knowledge".

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
83% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "cultural knowledge".

**M 5: Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
Syllabi for all required courses were collected by the Chair and examined for the presence or absence of specific learning outcomes.

**Source of Evidence:** Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Target for O1: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "knowledge of linguistic systems of English" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for six out of seven required courses contained "knowledge of linguistic systems of English" as a learning outcome.

**Target for O2: Teaching methodology**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "teaching methodology" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for six out of seven required courses contained "teaching methodology" as a learning outcome.

**Target for O4: Technology**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "technology" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for five out of seven required courses contained "technology" as a learning outcome.

**Target for O5: Communication**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "communication" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for seven out of seven required courses contained "communication" as a learning outcome.

**Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "connecting theory and practice" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for six out of seven required courses contained "connecting theory and practice" as a learning outcome.

**Target for O7: Cultural knowledge**
The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "cultural knowledge" as a learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The syllabi for two out of seven required courses contained "cultural knowledge" as a learning outcome.

**M 6: Master`s papers (O: 5, 6)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
94% of the students were rated "excellent" or "good" in writing and formatting/referencing (Outcome 5).

**Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice**
90% of students will be rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship (Outcome 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
89% of the students were rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship (Outcome 4).

**M 7: Classroom-based experience forms and reflections (O: 2, 6)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Teaching methodology**
100% of students will complete this requirement.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed the requirement.

**Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice**
100% of students will complete this requirement.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed the requirement.

**M 8: Professional development activities (O: 3)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O3: Professional development**
100% of students will complete the PD requirement.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of graduating students completed all required PD activities.

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

**Communication: Oral presentations**
The MA Paper Presentation rubric will be refined to better indicate the contribution of communication skills and strategies to the overall effectiveness of the MA Paper presentation. The MA Committee will meet to explore options for improving students' oral presentation skills, e.g., providing more explicit feedback on class presentations and offering workshops on preparing and giving oral
presentations.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Oral presentation of Master`s paper | Outcome/Objective: Communication
Implementation Description: By May, 2010, a new refined MA Paper Presentation rubric will be in place; the MA Committee will have decided up efforts to improve support for oral presentations and implementation of these will have begun.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MA Committee (Diane Belcher, chair)

Connecting theory and practice: MA paper
The MA Committee will meet to discuss this issue and determine whether changes in guidance provided for the writing of MA Papers are in order.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Master`s papers | Outcome/Objective: Connecting theory and practice
Implementation Description: The MA Committee will have met and discussed the need for changes in MA Paper supervision procedures.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MA Committee (Diane Belcher, chair)

Cultural knowledge
Current and former MA students will be interviewed in focus groups to determine how the MA program might improve cultural knowledge. The MA Committee will review the findings and make recommendations, which will be implemented upon approval of the graduate faculty.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Cultural knowledge
Implementation Description: By May, 2010, the focus group interview findings will have been reported to the MA Committee and recommendations made.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MA Committee (Diane Belcher, chair)

Knowledge of linguistic systems
Current and former MA students will be surveyed regarding this outcome; the survey will attempt to disambiguate "linguistic systems" in an effort to determine which particular system or systems, i.e., phonology, grammar, or discourse, students feel the need for improved confidence in. The MA Committee will review the survey results and make recommendations, which may involve changes in course content.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of linguistic systems of English
Implementation Description: The survey will have been implemented, analyzed, and reported to the MA Committee, which will have met and made recommendations to address the need for greater confidence in knowledge of linguistic systems.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MA Committee (Diane Belcher, chair)

Professional development confidence level
Focus group interviews of current and former MA students will be implemented to obtain information about the effectiveness of MA program preparation for involvement in professional development activities. The MA Committee will review results and make recommendations responsive to student (current and former) input.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Professional development
Implementation Description: By May, 2010, the focus group interview findings will have been reviewed by the MA Committee, who will have made recommendations, which, in turn will be acted upon.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MA Committee (Diane Belcher, chair)

---

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The MA Studies Committee is in the process of discussing development of rubrics to evaluate students' documentation of classroom-based experience and professional development activities.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In view of MA students' expressed wish for more options for teacher training, we have added AL 8480, Classroom Practices, formerly an elective, as an alternative way of meeting the "Practicum" requirement for the program. Now students may now take either AL 8900, Practicum, or AL 8480, Classroom Practices, or both, to meet this course requirement. In response to repeated interest in better preparation in technology for classroom use, as expressed in our annual survey of MA alumni, we have created a new elective, AL 8620, Technology and Language Teaching, which was approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee in 2009.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Given the low response rate to our MA alumni survey, we will focus on developing improved data collection methods to obtain more extensive feedback to guide us in defining and meeting our goals.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Applied Linguistics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Teaching experience (M: 4)
Graduates will be experienced teachers

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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 2: Research methodology (M: 1, 3)
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 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Professional development (M: 1)**

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 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Teacher mentoring (M: 4)**

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 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates.
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Professional development (O: 2, 3, 4)**

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

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of 18 active PhD students in their second year or beyond, 10 presented at a conference or published a scholarly paper. This included 19 presentations and 9 publications (3 articles, 2 book chapters, 2 book reviews, and 2 textbook related publications).

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of 18 active PhD students in their second year or beyond, 10 presented at a conference or published a scholarly paper. This included 19 presentations and 9 publications (3 articles, 2 book chapters, 2 book reviews, and 2 textbook related publications).

**Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of 18 active PhD students in their second year or beyond, 10 presented at a conference or published a scholarly paper. This included 19 presentations and 9 publications (3 articles, 2 book chapters, 2 book reviews, and 2 textbook related publications).

**M 2: Qualifying papers (O: 3)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics**

90% of students will pass the qualifying paper requirement.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All four students who completed their Qualifying Paper in the 2008-2009 academic year passed.

**M 3: Comprehensive examinations (O: 2, 3)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: Research methodology**

90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students passed their comprehensive examinations.
Target for O3: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics
90% of students will pass their comprehensive examinations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students passed their comprehensive examinations.

M 4: Teaching experience (O: 1, 5)
Students will graduate with substantial teaching experience in the Intensive English Program and in undergraduate courses in Applied Linguistics.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O1: Teaching experience
100% of students will teach at least 4 semesters at GSU. 90% of students will teach at least two undergraduate courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All graduates have taught at least 4 semesters, including at least 2 in the undergraduate program.

Target for O5: Teacher mentoring
100% of students will teach at least 4 semesters at GSU. 90% of students will teach at least two undergraduate courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All graduates have taught at least 4 semesters, including at least 2 in the undergraduate program.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
revisiting/revamping PhD assessment
mission outcomes goals
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Based on the departmental review, we are discussing changes to the PhD program. Once we have decided on changes, we are planning to develop rubrics (for example, to evaluate the comprehensive exam process) so that we have more informative data.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
To enhance professional development, we piloted an academic socialization course for our PhD students. We have submitted the new course to the Curriculum Committee.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The findings helped us gauge the professional productivity of the PhD students, but in other respects were of limited value. We are now exploring alternative measures that would provide more detailed information.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Art and Design Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

### Goals

**G 1: Critical thinking**

Students will gain broad knowledge of World art history and demonstrate critical-thinking relative to the study of the visual arts.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Critical thinking in core (G: 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).

### 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

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

**Critical thinking in Core Action Plan**

Continue to: 1) evaluate the assessment measures and targets in greater depth by drawing on national test standards for AH survey courses and 2) dedicate more class time to discussion of critical thinking in test format.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Low
- **Responsible Person/Group:** AH faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Faculty will incorporate more opportunities for discussion about critical thinking into class time.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Department evaluated the assessment measures and targets in order better to reflect national standards; faculty also dedicated more lecture time to discussion of critical thinking in test format.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Findings suggest that department needs to strive for better consistency across the core classes. Currently, an average of seven classes are taught per semester, each by different faculty members.
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: Professional Growth Competencies (M: 1)

Assessment done prior to student teaching semester. Student demonstrates potential for the following: cooperation, initiation, constructive reflection, organizational skills, effective verbal communication, professional appearance, punctual and regular attendance, openness to constructive criticism, potential for professional growth.

**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  
1.13 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 2: Instructional Planning - Senior Level (M: 1)

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

**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  
1.13 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

2.1 Faculty  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 3: Content Knowledge - Senior Level (M: 1)

The assessment is based on faculty observation in student teaching and on student teaching portfolio. The student 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. The student teaching portfolio consists of 10 examples of consistently achieved artwork presented according to professional presentations standards from the student’s selected studio art concentration. The artwork demonstrates technical competency, conceptual sophistication, and currency within contemporary art practice.

**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 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 4: Oral and Written Communication (M: 1)

Four essays submitted explaining four portfolio pieces from four different aesthetic viewpoints including composition, technical skills and craftsmanship, expressive qualities, meaning and content. Student demonstrates an oral ability to fluently discuss these viewpoints.

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

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: Classroom Management - Senior Level (M: 1)

Assessment done after student teaching semester. Student demonstrates the following: cooperation, initiation, constructive reflection, organizational skills, effective verbal communication, professional appearance, punctual and regular attendance, receptive to constructive criticism, professional growth.

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

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Student Teaching Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

The student teaching portfolio is the capstone assessment and consists of measures for content knowledge, lesson planning, classroom management, instructional strategies, classroom and student behavior management, assessment skills, and professional attributes.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Professional Growth Competencies**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 13 students evaluated, 11 received a score of 5 (85%) and 2 (15%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O2: Instructional Planning - Senior Level**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 13 students evaluated, 9 received a score of 5 (69%) and 4 (31%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O3: Content Knowledge - Senior Level**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Of the 13 students evaluated, 12 received a score of 5 (92%) and 1 received a score of 4 (8%).

**Target for O4: Oral and Written Communication**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Of the 13 students evaluated, 11 (85%) received a score of 5 and 2 (15%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O5: Classroom Management - Senior Level**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 5. The minimum score goal is 4.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Of the 13 students evaluated, 11 (85%) received a score of 5 and 2 (15%) received a score of 4.

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

**Use of video technology**
Video taping of student teachers and student presentations for critical review by faculty in order to ease the time consuming aspects of student placements in K-12 schools and other non-profit settings.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Considering the grant cycle for Tech Fee awards, we intend to make equipment purchases in the summer for use in Fall 2010.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Heeish

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The Art Education area will be writing a Tech Feegrant to acquire at least a dozen flip cameras for use by student teachers and students making presentations in other venues. The increased number of students required in student teaching courses and the number of student presentations completed prior to student teaching make it impossible for a teacher to be there an adequate number of times. A greater use of video and interactive internet will be explored for more efficient use of faculty time.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Art Education area has continued to work to provide not only excellent in-class instruction but also engaging field experiences for our students. In addition to understanding educational theories we are sending our students to teach in a variety of high need areas. In the past year students have observed or presented lessons at the Early Learning Center, a Latino Agency, Youth Art Connection, Inman Middle School, and the Spruill Art Center (with at risk students), and Arts Now schools. These experiences are in addition to the time they spend observing in the P-12 schools. Students reflect on their experiences in each placement and grow in their confidence to teach prior to student teaching.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Art Education area continues to respond to the need for more experiences for our students in the high need urban areas in a variety of contexts. These placements are very important for our students but require more and more time from faculty to arrange and facilitate. Finding ways to ease the time consuming aspects of student placements in the K-12 schools and other non-profit settings is a high priority for the coming year. The use of video of student teachers and student presentations is another goal to better utilize faculty time.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art Education MFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts, art education and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: • Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills • Expand students understanding as visual artists, art educators, scholars and advocates of the visual arts • Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world • Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Unknown (M: 1, 2, 3)
Unknown

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Missing (M: 1, 2, 3)
Missing

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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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: 1, 2, 3)
The educator is responsible for managing and mentoring student learning/development.

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
2.22 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

#### SLO 4: Professional Development (M: 1, 2, 3)

Educator thinks systematically about his/her practices and learns from professional reflection.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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

#### SLO 5: Partnerships with Learning Community (M: 1, 2, 3)

Educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

The written thesis is assessed for providing a scholarly background with theoretical justification, purpose and need for the study. The thesis requires students to collect and analyze data, discuss and synthesize conclusions, and present recommendations for further research.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Unknown**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

**Target for O2: Missing**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O3: Ability to Mentor**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the 5 students evaluated, 3 (60%) received a score of 5 and 2 (40%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O4: Professional Development**

Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 3.

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

**M 2: Exit Interview (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
An exit interview is conducted between faculty and student.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Unknown**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

**Target for O2: Missing**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O3: Ability to Mentor**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 3 (60%) received a score of 5 and 2 (40%) received a score of 4.

**Target for O4: Professional Development**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 3.

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

**M 3: Observation of Professional Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Student is observed by faculty in student teaching role.
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target for O1: Unknown**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

**Target for O2: Missing**
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Of the 5 student evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 4.

Target for O3: Ability to Mentor
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students evaluated, 3 (60%) received a score of 5 and 2 (40%) received a score of 4.

Target for O4: Professional Development
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 5 students evaluated, 4 (80%) received a score of 5 and 1 (20%) received a score of 3.

Target for O5: Partnerships with Learning Community
Scoring from 1-5. 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent. The target goal is 90% of the students achieving the target score goal of 4. The minimum score goal is 3.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Of the 5 students evaluated, 5 (100%) received a score of 5.

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

Low Residency with Online Course Offerings
We have restructured the MAEd program to operate as a low-residency program with 40% of the courses now offered online.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Beginning in the fall semester 2009.
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

Summer triad of courses
In order to engender greater cross disciplinary activity in our students classrooms, we are focusing on integrating the three required summer courses that address contemporary issues in art education, postmodern art history and a studio mixed media course.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Summer session 2010
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

Survey of cohort program
Having initiated a cohort aspect to the MAED program this year, we will survey the students at the end of the academic year to understand the effectiveness of this change and address any deficiencies cited in the survey.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The survey will be conducted at the conclusion of the academic year.
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We will continue developing our strategies and technological capabilities for online learning. We plan to make the summer graduate session of three courses, a highly integrated experience for students as they take courses in contemporary issues in art education, postmodern art history and a studio mixed media course. Working across disciplines as this should provide an exciting model for students to use when they assume their own classroom teaching responsibilities. While master’s students currently appear to be meeting the established learning outcomes, in the coming year the art education area will re-structure the MAEd so that students will progress through the program in cohort groups. We believe that the formation of cohorts will establish a more effective process for students to move through the program and also provide more accessible and consistent points for formatively assessing student progress.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Art Education area re-structured our MAEd program to be a low-residency program with most education and art education courses offered online (approximately 40%) and the studio courses offered on Saturdays. There is one summer session of 9 hours held on campus. In addition to changing much of the program's delivery system, we have changed our enrollment procedures so applications are only taken in the spring for entrance the following fall. Certification masters students and traditional master’s students are in the program, so our number of MAEd graduates will almost double. In addition, we underwent a review of our MAED program objectives and successfully consolidated them to five critical objectives. These five were reported on for the first time in this year and were deemed more effective and efficient.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

After the first cohort completes the program we will have a much better understanding of the issues involved in working with students in a low-residency program. We will survey students after the first art education course to gain a better understanding of their needs as the program progresses. Our advising for the MAEd has greatly improved due to the cohort grouping. We expect this improved contact with graduate students to continue.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art History BA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: •Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills •Expand students understanding as scholars and advocates of the visual arts •Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world •Engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of content (M: 1)
Student is able to recall pertinent art historical facts (i.e., artist, title, date), can identify artworks as belonging to specific cultures, periods, and places, and can define art historical vocabulary.

SLO 2: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)
Student is able to apply a range of art historical methods (i.e., formal analysis, semiotics, criticism, etc.), to apply appropriate methods to the analysis of particular works of art, and to make reasoned judgement about the validity of rival claims about art.

SLO 3: Research skills (M: 1)
Student is able to design and carry out an independent research project culminating in a substantial written document. Student is able to acquire, evaluate, and critique the scholarship relevant to an art-historical problem, and to propose solutions or contribute new insights into that problem.

SLO 4: Written communication skills (M: 1)
Student is able to explain art-historical principles, and to use art-historical terms in their proper context to explain and/or describe works of art or art-historical problems. Student can effectively communicate the results of research and critical thought in a well-written essay.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Graduation portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students are evaluated on the basis of a graduation portfolio assembled by graduating seniors in consultation with their principal advisors in the course of their final semester (or last 15 credit hours of study). The portfolio consists of a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper level Art History course, and an advance writing project involving art historical research.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Knowledge of content
Evaluation based on analysis of performance in 1000-level art history survey classes, and a review of the content-based sections of tests submitted with the graduation portfolio. Students evaluated: 11, Students achieving goal: 11, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3, Aim for an average score of: 4.5, Average score for this goal this academic year: 4.5
Target for O4: Written communication skills
Evaluation based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project submitted with the graduation portfolio. Number of students evaluated: 10, Number achieving goal: 10, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3, Aiming for an average score of: 4.5, Average score for this goal for this academic year: 4.1

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

AH 4990 as new capstone course for the major
The outcomes for Objectives 1 and 2 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills) were unchanged from the previous academic year. The students we evaluated are meeting our goals in both those areas, and we see no need for changes in our program with respect to these particular goals. One concern that we do have is that these scores may be somewhat inflated, since they are based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, and -- since submission of the graduation portfolio is still essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted may not be a representative sample. This problem should be solved in coming years, as more and more of our graduating majors will be required to pass through the new capstone course (AH 4990), and thus be required to submit a graduation portfolio. As we get a more truly representative sample of work, however, we may find that our average scores go down.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: AH 4990 has been adopted as the capstone course for the major, though it will be sometime before we have a critical mass taking completing the course. Therefore, we project that within two years we can effectively use it as a measure.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Glenn Gunhouse, John Decker, Kimberly Cleveland, Maria Gindhart, Melinda Hartwig, Susan Richmond, Akela Reason

AH 3000 - Intro to Art History Methodology
We have added a new course to our program (AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology), which we hope will improve the research skills of our majors by giving them training in art-historical methods early in their course of study. As more and more of our graduates are required to take this course as part of their program, we hope to see improvement in the scores for the Research Skills objective. In addition, our students now have the opportunity for instruction in library research skills under the guidance of Nedda Ahmed, the new library instructor in the fine arts area. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
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>Graduation Portfolio</td>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of content</td>
<td>Research skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: This course addition will have increased enrollment in the fall 2009 as a new requirement for the major.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Glenn Gunhouse, Maria Gindhart, Melinda Hartwig, Kimberly Cleveland, John Decker, Susan Richmond, Akela Reason

AH 3000 and AH 4990 as CTW courses
The average score for Objective 4 (Written Communication Skills) dropped slightly from the previous academic year (from 4.25 to 4.1). This was a disappointing result, given our focus in recent years on the need to improve the quality of our students' writing. We hope that with increased attention to writing in our designated CTW courses (AH 3000 and AH 4990), we will see improvement in the scores for this objective.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: All AH majors are required to take two CTW courses in their major beginning Fall 2009.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Glenn Gunhouse, Maria Gindhart, Melinda Hartwig, Kimberly Cleveland, John Decker, Susan Richmond, Akela Reason

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The scores for Objective 3 (Research Skills) were quite a bit lower than we'd like to see. The average of 3.8 was considerably below our goal of 4.5, and lower than the results for the other three objectives. We recognize that this is an area that we need to focus on...
more in the future. We have already added a new course to our program (AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology), which we hope will improve the research skills of our majors by giving them training in art-historical methods early in their course of study. As more and more of our graduates are required to take this course as part of their program, we hope to see improvement in the scores for the Research Skills objective. In addition, our students now have the opportunity for instruction in library research skills under the guidance of Naida Ahmed, the new library instructor in the fine arts area. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

**What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?**

In response to feedback from the College Learning Outcomes Assessment committee, the Art History Division has made the following changes to its Learning Outcomes Assessment objectives: - We have eliminated our current Objectives 6 (Competence in a Foreign Language) and 7 (Practice in Studio Art). These objectives are not strictly art-history objectives, and the question of whether our students have achieved them or not is made by faculty in other programs. - We have combined our current Objectives 1 and 2 (the two "Knowledge" objectives), reducing the number of our objectives to four: 1) Knowledge of Content 2) Critical Thinking Skills 3) Research Skills 4) Written Communication Skills - We adjusted the numbers we had been using for goals. Since the College committee asked us to make our objectives more clear to them and to our students, we are providing the following explanations: Knowledge of Content: Student is able to recall pertinent art-historical facts (i.e., artist, title, date) can identify artworks as belonging to specific cultures, periods, and places, and can define art historical vocabulary. Critical Thinking Skills: Students are able to apply a range of art historical methods (i.e., formal analysis, semiotics, criticism, etc.), to apply appropriate methods to the analysis of particular works of art, and to make reasoned judgments about the validity of rival claims about art. Research Skills: Student is able to design and carry out an independent research project culminating in a substantial written document. Student is able to acquire, evaluate, and critique the scholarship relevant to an art-historical problem, and to propose solutions or contribute new insights into that problem. Written Communication Skills: Student is able to explain art-historical principles, and to use art-historical terms in their proper context to explain and/or describe works of art or art-historical problems. Student can effectively communicate the results of research and critical thought in a well-written formal essay. Having made those changes, we then assessed our graduating students accordingly. Learning Outcomes for undergraduate Art Majors with a Concentration in Art History are evaluated on the basis of a graduation portfolio assembled by graduating seniors in consultation with their principal advisors in the course of their final semester (or last 15 credit-hours of study). The portfolio consists of a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, and an advanced writing project involving art-historical research. The degree of student mastery of each Learning Objective is evaluated according to the following scheme: 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very Good, 5-Excellent, Not evaluated

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The outcomes for Objectives 1 and 2 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills) were unchanged from the previous academic year. The students we evaluated are meeting our goals in both those areas, and we see no need for changes in our program with respect to these particular goals. One concern that we do have is that these scores may be somewhat inflated, since they are based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, and -- since submission of the graduation portfolio is still essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted may not be a representative sample. This problem should be solved in coming years, as more and more of our graduating majors will be required to pass through the new capstone course (AH 4990), and thus be required to submit a graduation portfolio. As we get a more truly representative sample of work, however, we may find that our average scores will improve.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The year's assessment showed that the average score for Objective 4 (Written Communication Skills) dropped slightly from the previous academic year (from 4.25 to 4.1). This was a disappointing result, given our focus in recent years on the need to improve the quality of our students' writing. We hope that with increased attention to writing in our designated CTW courses (AH 3000 and AH 4990), we will see improvement in the scores for this objective.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 3 and 4 were in part the result of students submitting papers that did not necessarily showcase their research and writing skills. It appears that students chose to submit papers on which they had achieved high grades, and these were not always the kinds of papers that demonstrated the quality of their art-historical research and writing (the high grades having been achieved, in some cases, by demonstrations of knowledge of content). We hope this problem will disappear in years to come, as more and more of our graduates pass through the new capstone course, in which they will be required to prepare a paper specifically for inclusion in their graduation portfolios.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The curriculum additions of AH 3000 and AH 4990, both designated as CTW courses for the major, should lead to improvement in research skills and written communication for our students. Each course is structured to provide assessment material that will guide us for future program development.
### 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: Analytical Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 6)**
Expertise in critical analysis of research evidence


**SLO 2: Oral Communication**
Evidence of excellence in all aspects of oral presentation


**SLO 3: Written Communication skills (M: 3, 4)**
Evidence of excellence in all aspects of writing


**SLO 4: Research skills (M: 3)**
The ability to gather relevant art historical evidence


**SLO 5: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills (M: 5)**
Acquisition of analytical and critical thinking skills relevant to art historical ideas, issues and provenance and scholarship


### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 6: Knowledge of Methods and Theories**
Knowledge of methods and theories of art history based on exposure to substantive scholarship and research


**O/O 7: Knowledge of Content**
Broad knowledge of world art history


**O/O 8: Competence in a Foreign Language**
Evidence of proficiency in written and oral communication in a foreign language


### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Foreign Language or Course Grades (O: 1)**
Results of foreign language test or course grades

| Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work |

**M 2: Seminars and/or Student Symposium (O: 1)**
Performance in seminar courses and / or Student Symposium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence:</th>
<th>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Astronomy PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Coming Soon

**Goals**

**G 1: Coming Soon**

Coming Soon

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

**O/O 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 3, 4)**

Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

**O/O 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

**O/O 5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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. 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.

**O/O 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2)**

Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Qualifying Exam 2 (O: 5)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and are available in the Qualifying Exam 2 Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Five students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 3.2 out of 5.0.

**M 2: Research Advisor Evaluation (O: 1, 4, 6)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and are the first section of the advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Two students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 5.0 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Two students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**M 6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Two students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**M 3: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**

Rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.5 out of 5.0. Two students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Ten committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**
The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in astronomy. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2008/2009 there were low scores in two outcomes (based on 5 students). In the previous three years the scores on those two outcomes were quite high scores in all outcomes including the two outcomes which had low scores this year. When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Measure: Motivations and Implications of Research | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Measure: Motivations and Implications of Research | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
Measure: Qualifying Exam 2 | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Measure: Research Advisor Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
Measure: Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication

Implementation Description: Assessment Committee will present results at a faculty meeting in the Fall of 2009, at the chairman’s discretion.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

**ACADEMIC QUESTIONS and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Since the action plan is of a review and report nature, accomplishing involves scheduling only.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes have been made since last year. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2008/2009 there were low scores in two outcomes (based on 5 students). In the previous three years the scores on those two outcomes were quite high scores in all outcomes including the two outcomes which had low scores this year. When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

These findings reflect a pretty healthy PhD program in astronomy. Although in a given year the assessments may show low scores in a particular area, those same scores are often much higher in the previous or next year. It is apparent that this is due to the small numbers of students and an individual student may greatly affect the scores. When the numbers are low, the department is typically working with a student to address the issues producing the low scores. Since each situation is different, it seems wise to deal with the students with low skill levels on an individual basis and not create any new structure.
BLD certification program had approximately 90 students in the certification program; 31 of them completed the certification program.

**Goals**

**G 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**G 2: Understands student development regarding learn**
Understands student development regarding learning.

**G 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.**
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

**G 4: Can Effectively plan and assess instruction.**
Can Effectively plan for and assess instruction.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of 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: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**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
3.31 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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
4.3 Technology
6.1 Recruitment

**SLO 2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn. (G: 2) (M: 2)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, and provides learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/or behavioral development/growth.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards

**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
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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
4.3 Technology
6.1 Recruitment

**SLO 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of children. (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and uses effective communication and professional behavior while differentiating instruction based on student need.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**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
3.31 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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
### 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.1 Recruitment

---

**SLO 4: Effectively plan and assess instruction. (G: 4) (M: 4)**

The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children standards.

---

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.1 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
- 3.31 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
- 4.43 Effective utilization of resources
- 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

---

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.1 Recruitment

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Teaching Sequence (O: 1)

EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include: Rationale and design, lesson plans and continuous assessments and post-assessments and discussion of findings.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence Rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

With an N of 31, 87% of students scored a 3 or above on the EXC 7190 teaching sequence rubric. The mean score was 3.2.

#### M 2: Pupil change project. (O: 2)

P-12 change project using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include a description of the behavior to be changed, a treatment for change, baseline and treatment data, and analysis and discussion of the results.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The mean score was 3.6.

#### M 3: Performance Evaluation (O: 3)

Performance Evaluation Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include indicators based on the Georgia Framework.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of children.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The mean score was 3.7.

#### M 4: Lesson Plan (O: 4)

Lesson Plan Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include lesson title and description, primary learning outcomes, procedures, technology, assessment, modifications, extension, and reflection.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Effectively plan and assess instruction.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
With an N of 31, 97% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The mean score was 3.7.

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

**Action Plan for All Indicators**

Data for the Initial Certification program in BLD were collected on new measures this year as recommended in our APR plan. The data indicate that student performance remains above the 90% target mark for 3 of the 4 measures and at 87% for one measure. The faculty have indicated that the student’s performance on these measures is adequate and a true reflection of their abilities. Therefore, the faculty will continue to implement the course of action adopted for this program. Finally, the faculty have designed a new rubric for performance that will align with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty have indicated they want to continue to use the new measures introduced this year. They have also designed a new rubric for performance that will align with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Data for the Initial Certification program in BLD were collected on new measures this year as recommended in our APR plan. Also, the faculty have designed a new rubric for performance that will align with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data indicate that student performance remains above the 90% target mark for 3 of the 4 measures and at 87% for one measure. The faculty have indicated that the student's performance on these measures is adequate and a true reflection of their abilities. Therefore, the faculty will continue to implement the course of action adopted for this program. The faculty have designed a new rubric for performance that will align with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.
**Goals**

**G 1: Understands student development regarding learning**
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

**G 2: Can effectively teach diverse learners.**
Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners.

**G 3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Student demonstrates understanding of learning. (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, by providing learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/or behavioral development/growth.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**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
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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
4.4 External Relations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners. (G: 2) (M: 2)**
The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**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
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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher demonstrates understanding of 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: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: P-12 Change Project (O: 1)**
P-12 change project using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include a description of the behavior to be changed, a
treatment for change, baseline and treatment data, and analysis and discussion of the results.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Student demonstrates understanding of learning.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

With an N of 10, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The mean score was 3.6.

**M 2: Performance Evaluation (O: 2)**

Performance Evaluation Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include indicators based on the Georgia Framework.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

With an N of 10, 100% of students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric. The mean score was 3.6.

**M 3: Comprehensive Exam (O: 3)**

Written Comprehensive Exam scored by a Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O3: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on their comprehensive exams.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

With an N of 10, 93% of students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on their comprehensive exams. The mean score was 3.2.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We intend to continue using the new measures. We will also implement a new format for the comprehensive exam.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Data for the Masters Program in BLD were collected on new measures this year as recommended in our APR plan.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Data indicate that student performance on all the new indicators met or exceeded the target levels. Moreover, faculty have indicated that the student's performance on these projects is adequate and a true reflection of their abilities and will continue to use the new measures. Even though our target was met re. the comprehensive exam scores, performance on the comprehensive exams was a bit lower than in previous years and the faculty have noted that the current exam content and format does not reflect key changes in content in core courses sufficiently. Therefore, a new format for the comprehensive exam is being designed, with implementation planned for the 2009-2010 academic year. The faculty will provide students currently in the program with the option to complete comprehensive exams in the revised format.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Biology Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 communication and analysis of biological issues are stressed in our core courses.
**Goals**

**G 1: To provide a foundation of Biological concepts.**
In the core, the Department of Biology seeks to introduce basic Biology content with an overview of components of the Scientific Method. Students will be exposed to conventional Biological themes and real-world applications of concepts.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content in Biology (M: 1, 3)**
Students will be able to recall basic content in Biology, including but not limited to: history, conventional metabolic pathways, structure/function of cells, structure/function of human physiology, and how these topics pertain to real-world applications.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Communication (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will be expected to be able to express ideas about biological content both orally and in writing.

**O/O 3: Application of the Scientific Method (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.

**O/O 4: Analysis (M: 1, 2)**
Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in biology.

**O/O 5: Basic field/lab techniques**
Students will be able to perform basic techniques used in biological research which are applied in a laboratory setting and, in some cases, in outdoor settings such as data collection.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Manuscript critique (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Biol 2240 Spring 2008  40 Students were assigned a scientific paper to read. They had to write a critical review of this paper, including additional work that has been done related to the topic. 85% of the students scored at least 75%
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
70% will receive an 80% or better

**Target for O2: Communication**
70% will receive an 80% or better

**Target for O3: Application of the Scientific Method**
70% will receive an 80% or better

**Target for O4: Analysis**
70% will receive an 80% or better

**M 2: Interpretation of Biological Diagrams (O: 2, 3, 4)**
Biol 2108 Spring 2009  n=84 Students had to describe what was reported in a figure from the textbook. Data are reported as % of students who correctly identified what data was represented by the figure. 74% of students scored 80% or higher
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**M 3: Critiquing the value of a Scientific statement (O: 1, 2)**
Critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context Biol 2107 Summer 08 57 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. Critique a statement: 70 % of students scored 80% or higher Critique a figure: 79% of students scored 80% or higher.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Georgia State University
## Goals

**G 1: To critically think about and communicate Biology**
Students will be able to recall basic concepts in Biology, think critically and evaluate Biological claims, and communicate these concepts both in writing and orally.

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>Mini Lecture followed by 1 page summary</td>
<td>Communicate effectively in oral and written forms.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>Group project (design outreach program)</td>
<td>Students will be able to work effectively in group situations.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>Analysis of scientific data</td>
<td>Students were asked to determine the mRNA sequence corresponding to a polypeptide sequence.</td>
<td>Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>Make a prediction based on science data</td>
<td>Question asked to predict DNA replication mechanism based on data</td>
<td>Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>Content in Genetics question</td>
<td>Question asking number of mRNA nucleotides corresponding to a protein of specific length.</td>
<td>Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>Written critique about a manuscript</td>
<td>Students were assigned a scientific paper to read.</td>
<td>Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>Portfolio construction and presentation</td>
<td>Students had to pick an animal and write a portfolio.</td>
<td>Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9</td>
<td>Mini lecture</td>
<td>Each student will present a mini lecture and provide an accompanying paper.</td>
<td>Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10</td>
<td>Lab Technique</td>
<td>Students were tested on their ability to pipette correctly</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>Animal ecological design project</td>
<td>Each student designed an animal that lived in a different environment than its ancestor.</td>
<td>Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12</td>
<td>Ability to use Biological Instruments</td>
<td>Students were asked to determine whether a sample had DNA or protein using a spectrophotometer</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**M 13: Written critique about a Biological diagram**

Biol 3840 Fall 08 n=40 Students had to describe what was reported in a figure from the textbook. Data are reported as % of students who correctly identified what data was represented by the figure. Critique a figure: 73% of students scored 80% or higher.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**M 14: Powerpoint presentation**

Biol 4930/6930 Summer 08 n=10 Students were assigned pages from the textbook. They had to prepare a powerpoint presentation and present it to the class. 100% of students scored 85% or higher

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 15: Figure Interpretation**

Biol 2106 Spring 2009 n=84 Students had to describe what was reported in a figure from the textbook. Data are reported as % of students who correctly identified what data was represented by the figure. 74% of students scored 80% or higher

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 16: Animal-habitat matching**

Bio 3840 Spring 2009 n=50 Students were given synapomorphies and animals. Then they designed a cladogram predicting where the animals fit based on the characteristics. 87% of students scored 90% or higher

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**M 17: Pre-post test of knowledge**

Course: BIOL 1120 Fall 2008 Assessment: Pre-Post Testing for Knowledge (Bloom's Levels 1 & 2) Data: Comparison of Initial vs. Final online quiz covering the comprehensive course content. Students who took both quizzes, and spent more than 10 minutes taking the quizzes, were used in the calculation. Outcome: 75% of the students improved their scores by 20% or more.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**M 18: Pre-Post Testing for Knowledge BIOL 1120**

Course: BIOL 1120 Spring 2009 Assessment: Pre-Post Testing for Knowledge (Bloom's Levels 1 & 2) Data: Comparison of Initial vs. Final online quiz covering the comprehensive course content. Students who took both quizzes, and spent more than 10 minutes taking the quizzes, were used in the calculation. Outcome: 75% of the students improved their scores by 15% or more.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**M 19: Revised Case Study BIO4428**

Course: BIO 4428 Assessment: Exam Revision Data: The first exam was one complex case study (question can be sent, but it's large). The question was given in class to assess the students ability to quickly synthesize what they had learned in class. Students were then allowed to take the question home and submit a revised answer. Outcome: >50% of the class successfully provided an adequate answer to the question (score was 50% or greater). Upon reflection and further analysis, over 85% of the students were able to provide a competent answer to the question (score of 80% or higher).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 20: Pre-post test of knowledge BIO3800**

BIOL3800. A pre/post 10 question test about general concepts in molecular cell. They were on the level of Bloom's 1-2. Outcome: The pre average score was 4/10 and the post average score was 7/10. The average change was 4/10 (not everyone took the post test but of those that took both, their scores went up by 40%). 67% scored 70% or better on the post test.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**M 21: Student Presentation BIO3880**

Course: BIOL 3880 Assessment: Student Presentation Data: Students were required to research a specific bacterial species (or genus in some cases), and then make a presentation to the class. Evaluation was on successful communication of information, and was assessed by both in class evaluation of the presentation, evaluation of a written paper on the organism, and on how well students answered question regarding these organisms on their final exam. Students who demonstrated an understanding of the organism during the presentation, whose paper represented collegiate level scholarship (paper received 80% or higher), and had a high success rate of information delivery (represented by more than 80% of the students correctly answering questions), were considered to have shown competency in this assignment. Outcome: Greater than 85% of the students were considered to have shown competency in their communication.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 22: Dilution Scheme problem solving BIO3890**

Course: BIOL 3890 Assessment: Final Exam Question (complex dilutions) Data: Students are taught to calculate dilution schemes for use in enumeration of bacteria. The following question requires the students take the learned principles and formula and apply them in a new situation (Bloom's level 3). Given the following serial dilution, what is the colony count of the original sample if 0.1ml of the final dilution yields 185 organisms? 1:10 2:10 1:100 1:100 (Final Dilution) Outcome: Greater than 75% of the students were able to completely answer the question and demonstrate the mechanics of how they got there.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

---

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

**Action Plan Biology Fall 2009**

One issue in our curricula that was identified from assessment data collection was the discontinuity of topics covered in the same courses. We realized that in Cell & Molecular Biology, for example, instructors varied more from topic to topic than expected. This is a
problem since our courses constitute components of a building, continuous degree program. Our dept. is holding subcommittee
meetings with instructors that teach the same courses to form a concrete consensus on what topics must be covered in major
courses. This will standardize the degree program so that students receive similar material in the same courses regardless of
the instructor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Cruz, Therese Poole

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
The main plan of action that the department is implementing is offering the capstone CTW Senior Seminar mentioned above.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year’s assessment data revealed a deficiency in the critical reading and writing skills among upper-level students. The
department is implementing a senior-level capstone course in which students will analyze research manuscripts and then attend a
lecture by a scientist who works in the area being studied by the students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Some of the assessment data suggests that our gateway course to enter the major, Cell and Molecular Biology, covers material that is
also being taught in another required course, Biochemistry. We are currently working with the Chemistry Dept. to resolve this issue of
redundant material in the curricula.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Biology MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:35 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Student Learning Outcomes, Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings and Action Plans

O 1: Scientific Content Students will demonstrate the ability to choose an appropriate topic, comprehend, and organize information
from current scientific literature by preparing a non-thesis report or a thesis. Related Measures: M 1: The non-thesis report
Students in the non-thesis track enroll in Biol 8888, the capstone course. A rubric, which is made available to students and faculty, is
used to provide a uniform evaluation metric. 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 mentor, who offers constructive criticism. 3) After addressing comments from
the mentor, students submit the corrected copy to a faculty committee composed of the faculty mentor and a faculty reader who
evaluate the paper using a 1 to 5 scale for each of three categories. Students are asked to demonstrate their ability to describe and
organize conceptually complex scientific material in a way that provides background information and rationale to justify the
experimental endeavor that they have chosen. Achievement Target: 70% of students are expected to achieve a score of 4 or higher
on a 5 point scale in part 1 of the rubric Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not met A random sample of 12 non-thesis
M. S. graduates were evaluated using the rubric and 58% (7/12 scored 4 or 5) achieved the target score. M 2: Thesis Report 1)
Students prepare a thesis proposal, that is reviewed by a committee of at least three faculty members. Upon approval of the
proposal, students register for Biol 8999 and 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. Achievement
Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings
(2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three
proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07
and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Six students submitted a thesis
proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Three students
submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on
the thesis track. O 2: Scientific Inquiry Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area
of concentration in biology. Related Measures: M 1: The non-thesis Report Students in the non-thesis track are asked to
demonstrate the ability to analyze relevant data from the literature and/or from the student’s laboratory. Students are evaluated on
their ability to formulate logical arguments supporting interpretations of the data and describe the limit of our understanding about the
chosen topic. Achievement Target: 65% of students achieve a score of 4 or higher on a 5 point scale in part 2 of the rubric
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met A random sample of 12 non-thesis M. S. graduates were evaluated using the
rubric. 42% (10 of 12 (83%) scored 4 or 5. M 2: Thesis Report 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. Achievement Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track. O 3: Critical Thinking Students will be able to critically assess the findings they have presented and formulate a reasonable hypothesis for future experiments. Related Measures: M 1: Non-thesis Report Students are asked to critique data sets and generate a speculative but testable hypothesis with alternative outcomes. It is expected that this section of the report be accompanied by an appropriate experimental design for testing the hypothesis. Achievement Target: 60% of students are expected to achieve a score of 4 or higher on a 5 point scale in part 3 of the rubric. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: not met A random sample of 12 non-thesis M. S. graduates was evaluated using the rubric. 50% (6 of 12) scored 4 or 5. M 2: Thesis Report 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. Achievement Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track.

O/O 2: Scientific Inquiry

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Three M.S. degrees were awarded to biology doctoral students as non-terminal degrees. Of the 58 students enrolled only as M. S. students, 53 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

O/O 3: Insure that students graduate in a timely manner (M: 1)

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Of the 58 students awarded a degree, 46 (79%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: three M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 58 students enrolled only as M. S. students, 53 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

O/O 4: Insure that students graduate in a timely manner

Related Measures: M 3: Time for completion of MS degree Students should complete the MS degree in a timely fashion. Achievement Target: 60% of students should complete their MS degree within 3 years. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 58 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 23.9 months, while the median was 22 months. Of the 58 students awarded a degree, 46 (79%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: three M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree.] Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement 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.] Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years. Related Action Plans:

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: The Thesis and Non-thesis Report (O: 3)

The thesis and the non-thesis report is the capstone assignment for both tracks (thesis and non-thesis) in Biology. These capstones provide a measure of the progress of M. S. students in scientific inquiry, scientific content and scientific communication. O 0: Scientific Inquiry 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. Scientific Content Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Scientific Communication Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

Goals

G 1: Graduate Education Goals for the 21st Century

The accumulation of information in biology and related fields is increasing geometrically. In addition, ethical and problematic issues associated with environmental health, public health and individual health confront each of us everyday. Our goal is to train biologists to meet these challenges. We provide our students with a curriculum that emphasizes training in scientific literacy and critical
thinking. We also provide them with opportunities to participate in internships and contribute to research efforts that explore a variety of frontiers in the life sciences.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Related Measures: M 1: Ph.D. Qualifying Examination 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 they submit their written proposal to the Department 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. Achievement Target: 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 in six months. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 19 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (79%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement 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 during the Spring semester, and the fourth has left the program. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Fall semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their examinations. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (83%) received a Pass, and 17/18 (94%) received a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months. Related Action Plans: 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. For 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report. M 2: Time to receipt of degree 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. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 24 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 5.8 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. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.11 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Partially Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

**O/O 3: Scientific Communication (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats. Related Measures: M 1: Ph.D. Qualifying Examination 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. Achievement Target: 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 in six months. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 19 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (79%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement 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 during the Spring semester, and the fourth has left the program. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 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 during the Fall semester, and the fourth has left the program. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 9 (45%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months. Related Action Plans: 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. For 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Sp07 semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their evaluation. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 15 (83%) received a Pass, and 17/18 (94%) received a Pass. Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Both of the two who received a Qualified Pass met the conditions of their qualified status within six months. Related Action Plans: 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report. M 2: Time to receipt of degree 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. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 24 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. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.11 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Partially Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Details for Action Plans Established This Cycle (O: 2, 3)**

Details for Action Plans Established This Cycle 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. Priority: High Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. graduate directors (Drs. G. Pierce, C.-D. Liu, and C. Jiang). 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.

Source of Evidence: Efficiency

**M 2: Details for Action Plans Established this Cycle (O: 2, 3)**

Details for Action Plans Established This Cycle 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. Priority: High Responsible Person/Group: Ph.D. graduate directors (Drs. G. Pierce, C.-D. Liu, and C. Jiang). 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.

Source of Evidence: Efficiency
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. 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.

This Mission was formulated in 2005-2006. It was not moved to this cycle when WEAVE was updated.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 1)

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

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Model Building Ability (M: 2, 3)

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students will be able to clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics in a given business problem.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Understanding of Techniques (M: 3)

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Software Skills (M: 4)

Students will acquire expertise in the selection and use of key decision making software packages.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 1)

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students will be measured on their ability to a) understand the business goals, b) identify the key variables that need to be analyzed, c) analyze the potential relationships among the variables and d) interpret the results of their analysis.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 1 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from courses across the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year Learning Outcome 1. Rubric Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Understanding of the business goal / issues Is able to state the key issues clearly and accurately Either clarity or accuracy can be improved Both clarity and accuracy are below expectation It is clear that the student does not understand the issues ii. Identifying Key variables that need to be analyzed Knows clearly what variables must be used to represent the key issue(s) Some lack of clarity in expressing the key variables Unsure or incomplete understanding of what needs to be analyzed. Does not understand the key variable that relate to the issues. iii. Analysis potential relationships among variables Accurate and thorough qualitative analysis of the situation Some lack of clarity in expressing the relationships Weak understanding of relationships among concepts/variables Very little understanding of how variables/concepts are related. iv. Interpretation of results Can clearly relate
the results of model building and quantitative analysis back to the main issue Can make the connection of model results to
tosituation most of the time Some errors in interpretation of results in the context of the situation Inability to connect the results of
model with the situation at hand.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Measure 1 Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation Average i. Understanding of the business goal / issues 3.62 ii Identifying
Key variables that need to be analyzed 3.65 iii. Analysis potential relationships among variables 3.68 iv. Interpretation of
results 3.50

**M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 2)**

In developing a model students will be measured on their ability to a) identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics,
b) identify key independent variables and their metrics, c) manage data collection, cleaning and transformation, and d) develop and
validate a model.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Model Building Ability**

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 2 is to be used in scoring on assignments and
projects from MGS 8150. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student in the
program will be evaluated on this rubric in MGS 8150 each time the class is offered. Learning Outcome 2 Model Building Ability
Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Identifying the dependent variable and appropriate metrics
Can clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about
measuremnt Unsure about the dependent variable Does not understand the connection between the issue at hand and the
dependent variable ii Identifying Key independent variables and their metrics Can clearly identify the independent variable(s) and
the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement Unsure about the independent variables Does
not understand the connection between the dependent and the independent variables iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning,
transformations Accurate and thorough preliminary analysis of the data Most parts of preliminary analysis done well Skipped or
misunderstood some aspects of data preparation Poor understanding of the need to examine data carefully before modeling. iv. Model
Development and validation Clear demonstration of a viable model and results from a validation. Possibly accurate model,
not validated sufficiently Some errors in model building Model inappropriate or has too many errors

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Measure 2 Model Building Ability i. Identifying the dependent variables and appropriate metrics 3.82 ii Identifying Key
independent variables and their metrics 3.76 iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations 3.59 iv. Model
Development and validation 3.47

**M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 2, 3)**

Students will show skills using a) regression analysis, b) time-series forecasting, c) factor and cluster analysis, and d) discriminant
analysis and/or logistic regression.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Model Building Ability**

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 3 is to be used in scoring on assignments and
projects from the curriculum. Because of the small number of students in the MS Business Analysis program each student
in the program will be evaluated on this rubric in every course where it is applicable during the academic year Learning Outcome
3 Rubric Understanding of Techniques Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Regression Analysis
Clear understanding of when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the
application of the technique or interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are
interpreted. Poor understating of why, when and how the technique is applied. ii Time Series Forecasting Clear understanding of
when and how to perform the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or
interpretation of results. Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor
understanding of why, when and how the technique is applied. iii. Factor/Cluster Analysis Clear understanding of when and how to perform
the technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results.
Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how
the technique is applied. iv. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression Clear understanding of when and how to perform the
technique and interpret the results. Occasional uncertainty about the application of the technique or interpretation of results.
Makes some errors in applying the technique, or in the way the results are interpreted. Poor understanding of why, when and how
the technique is applied.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Measure 3: Understanding of Techniques i. Regression Analysis 3.88 ii Time Series Forecasting 3.82 iii. Factor/Cluster
Analysis 2.85 iv. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression 3.40

**M 4: Software Skills (O: 4)**

This measure evaluates the students' expertise in using key software in business decision analysis and problem solving situations. It
will be assessed during the completion of projects and assignments across the curriculum.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Software Skills**

Learning Outcome 4 Rubric Software Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Microsoft Excel
Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Well designed spreadsheets. Can perform most tasks well. Needs
help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects
Inaccurate spreadsheets, sloppy work. Needs constant help to perform expected tasks. ii SPSS Expert use of software. Has ability

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Measure 4: Software skills i. Microsoft Excel 3.91 ii SPSS Not Scored iii. SAS 3.22

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

**Continual Improvement Actions**

The assessment data show that both the programs are currently meeting or exceeding expectations, and have shown improvement over the data in 2008. With this in mind, the key elements of the action plan are as follows: 1. To continue the efforts made over the past few years in keeping the course material current, updating cases and examples to reflect industry practices today. 2. To add more resources online to aid in software competency. 3. To encourage students to engage in collaborative learning. Students post projects on the web and learn from each other's work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** BA Faculty Members  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The key strategy is to remain proactive and ensure that the content in each course remains current, with updated examples and cases.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The main area of weakness last year was students' ability to gain sufficient competence with SAS software. Additional resources were made available online and extra time spent in the classroom to address that issue in the Data Mining course.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment this year meets or exceeds the criteria we set in all the areas. Evidence shows students performing well in all the major areas of Business Modeling, Data Mining and other Analyses. The faculty in this area has been proactive in creating course offerings that are currently in demand in industry. Anecdotal evidence from graduates suggests that the MS and MBA programs in this area have been successful.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

There have not been any major operational changes in the Business Analysis unit. The faculty members believe that the current structure is effective in continuing both assessment and ongoing improvement actions.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The information that was collected in Business Analysis with respect to both the MS and MBA concentration was useful in supporting the decision to continue the current approach to assessment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE In both the MS and the MBA program improvement initiatives will continue along the same lines as in 2008-09, with the content changed as set out in the two Action Plans for Business Analysis.

---

Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section
Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking Assessment in the Core
Area D Critical Thinking Assessment for Chemistry. The American Chemical Society provides national-level exit exams for all the area D courses within the chemistry program. A representative faculty committee for area D was formed in 2004 and 8 questions from each test were chosen as questions that would require critical thinking. The faculty voted that a 2/8 would demonstrate appropriate critical thinking skills. The expected outcomes were based on the Department of Chemistry Learning Outcome rubric submitted to the Provost's office prior to Fall 2004.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: ACS exit exams (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
A score of 4/8 is the goal.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
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: ACS exam for 1151 (O: 1)
4/8 Critical thinking questions correct
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: ACS exit exams
Average student score was 4.7/8. 62% of students got at least 4 questions correct.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average student score was 4.7/8. 62% of students got at least 4 questions correct.

M 2: ACS exam in 1152 (O: 1)
ACS results of 8 critical thinking questions off of Chem 1152 exam
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: ACS exit exams
4/8 correct

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average score 4.5/8. 64% of students received 4 or better

M 3: ACS Exit exam in 1211 (O: 1)
Students got 4/8 on 1211 ACS exit exam on critical thinking problems
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: ACS exit exams
Students should receive 4/8 on Critical thinking questions

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average Score 5.7 correct 76% of students received at least a 4/8

M 4: ACS result in 1212 (O: 1)
Students should receive at least a 4/8 on critical thinking questions on the ACS exam
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: ACS exit exams
4/8 on critical thinking questions on exit exam

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average score was 6.2/8 80% of students received at least a 4/8
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Chemistry BS

(M: 1, 2)

G 2: laboratory report rubric
A rubric has been fashioned which includes all learning outcomes. A representative sample of these reports will be assessed from 1 - 6 for each learning outcome.

SLO 2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry (M: 1, 2)

Full Description: 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.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society
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.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Technology (M: 2)**

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: American Chemical Society

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**SLO 5: Understanding current Issues in chemistry (M: 1, 2)**

1e. Know how chemistry can help solve problems in society. 2e. Understand safety and waste control - impact on society.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 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.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6 Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**6.2 Undergraduate Experience**

**O/O 6: Current Laboratory Practices (M: 1, 2)**

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.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**6.2 Undergraduate Experience**

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: ACS exit exams (O: 2, 4, 5, 6)**

Many chemistry courses have national exit exams. Specific questions from these exams will be used to target different outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry**

56% of students received 3/5 in the 4110 critical thinking section.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**

For the exit exams 72% received 3/5 or better on the 4110 exam and 63% received 3/5 on the 4120 exam.

**M 2: laboratory reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

The senior level analytical courses (4000, 4010 and 4190) use laboratory reports to assess different outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills**

80% of students were rated adequate (3/6) or better on their communication skills portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met

80% of students were rated adequate (3/6) or better on their communication skills portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry**

83% of students were ranked adequate (3/6) on the critical thinking portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met

83% of students were ranked adequate (3/6) on the critical thinking portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Target for O3: Technology**

97% of students were ranked as adequate (3/6) or better on the technology portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met

97% of students were ranked as adequate (3/6) or better on the technology portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**

57% of students were ranked as adequate (3/6) or better on the analytical skills portion of the laboratory report rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Partially Met

57% of students were ranked as adequate (3/6) or better on the analytical skills portion of the laboratory report rubric.
Target for O5: Understanding current Issues in chemistry

87% of students received adequate or better on the Understanding current issues in chemistry portion of the laboratory report rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

87% of students received adequate or better on the Understanding current issues in chemistry portion of the laboratory report rubric.

Target for O6: Current Laboratory Practices

82% of students received a score of adequate or better on the Current Laboratory Practices portion of the laboratory report rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

82% of students received a score of adequate or better on the Current Laboratory Practices portion of the laboratory report rubric.

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

Action Plan

The Department of Chemistry serves not only students who have declared chemistry as their major but also students in biology, for which general chemistry is a prerequisite for the first course in the biology major (Principles of Biology), physics, for which chemistry is a required minor and pre-medical students. In addition any major can use chemistry 1151/1152 or 1211/1212 as the laboratory sequence required by the University for evaluation. This report addresses the efforts to increase retention in the courses which are used by both chemistry and non-chemistry majors as part of the core curriculum (1151/1152, 1211/1212) and courses used by persons wishing to minor in chemistry (2400/3410). The second part of the report addresses the efforts to improve the retention, progression and graduation of persons who major in chemistry. Introductory Courses "Many introductory science courses are responsible for driving off many students either from a science major or from taking science courses." (Reform in Undergraduate Science Education in the 21st Century) The cause of the "turn off" factor of these 1000 and 2000 level courses one of the key factors that will affect retention is the number of students who receive a D, F withdraw from the course. These students either are turned off by science and change majors or are forces to retake the course causing the department to offer more sections both of which are unfavorable outcomes. Over the past four years the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence believing those courses will affect the most people. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia's RPG initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RPG initiative allowed the department to attack the retention problem in three ways; the introduction of peer tutorials, weekly meetings between faculty members who teach the courses in order to discuss ideas, methods and problems in the various units and a redesign in the courses. Peer Led Tutorials are an effective way to allow students to receive help and ask questions in a small group setting (25 as opposed to 100 – 200). Students enrolled in 1211, 1212, 2400 or 3410 can register for a tutorial which is led by either an undergraduate student who has recently excelled in one of the courses or a graduate student. The grade for the course is based on class attendance and participation by the student. We have found that the tutorials have been moderately effective in the 1211 and 1212 sequence but less effective in the 2400 and 3410 sequence. The department is currently modifying the tutorials so that they are more interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout giving help where needed. We believe that this activity will more actively engage the student allowing him/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. In addition the department is developing a book of "worked out" problems which students can download. Weekly Communication Weekly meetings between the faculty members who teach introductory courses were started initially with a senior faculty member who facilitated discussion on what materials in the text were more important and what topics should be less emphasized. Since most people teaching the general chemistry course come in as visiting faculty and very little experience teaching except as a TA we found that there is a preconceived notion that everything in the text must be taught. Through these meetings the general chemistry faculty has been able to increase the depth of student knowledge rather than go for complete "coverage" of the text. In addition the faculty have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. It is often difficult to schedule these meetings around teaching schedules so this part of the action plan has been waning over the past semester, but we hope that we can continue this as part of the upcoming year's action plan. Course Redesign In the eight sections of CHEM1211 and CHEM1212, General Chemistry I and II in Spring 2009, 151 out of 255 of students enrolled are biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of the faculty specializing in some subfield of biochemistry (biophysical, biochemical, bioorganic or medicinal chemistry). Since all of the biology majors and a large number of chemistry majors will be involved in learning and researching biologically related topics, we believe that linking the common concepts in biology and chemistry together will facilitate the understanding and relevance of the topics in General Chemistry and help students better integrate the two disciplines. To facilitate this process, we are analyzing the topics covered in General Chemistry I and II in order to determine which topics have biologically relevant examples that can be easily added to the curriculum without taking away from the chemistry department's mission as an American Chemical Society (ACS) certified program. The addition of biological examples and illustrations will help students make connections between the chemistry and biology. We hypothesize that adding biologically-related material will require the "weeding out" of some traditional topics which are no longer relevant, thus allowing a greater emphasis on the more relevant topics. This is the most recent addition to our action plan and is still in the infancy stages. Analysis of the Effect of Action Plan A ten year analysis of the 1151 course shows an increase from 239 students in 1998 to 361 students in 2008 (51% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 25.5% to 18.6%. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 1152 course shows an increase from 208 students in 1998 to 333 students in 2008 (60% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5% to 20.1% in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7%. The ACS scores are statistically the same. Most of the gains in DFW rates have occurred over the past 5 years. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentile or better.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

82% of students received a score of adequate or better on the Current Laboratory Practices portion of the laboratory report rubric.

Weekly Peer Led Tutorials

Weekly peer led tutorials are an effective way to allow students to receive help and ask questions in a small group setting (25 as opposed to 100 – 200). Students enrolled in 1211, 1212, 2400 or 3410 can register for a tutorial which is led by either an undergraduate student who has recently excelled in one of the courses or a graduate student. The grade for the course is based on class attendance and participation by the student. We have found that the tutorials have been moderately effective in the 1211 and 1212 sequence but less effective in the 2400 and 3410 sequence. The department is currently modifying the tutorials so that they are more interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout giving help where needed. We believe that this activity will more actively engage the student allowing him/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. In addition the department is developing a book of "worked out" problems which students can download. Weekly Communication Weekly meetings between the faculty members who teach introductory courses were started initially with a senior faculty member who facilitated discussion on what materials in the text were more important and what topics should be less emphasized. Since most people teaching the general chemistry course come in as visiting faculty and very little experience teaching except as a TA we found that there is a preconceived notion that everything in the text must be taught. Through these meetings the general chemistry faculty has been able to increase the depth of student knowledge rather than go for complete "coverage" of the text. In addition the faculty have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. It is often difficult to schedule these meetings around teaching schedules so this part of the action plan has been waning over the past semester, but we hope that we can continue this as part of the upcoming year's action plan. Course Redesign In the eight sections of CHEM1211 and CHEM1212, General Chemistry I and II in Spring 2009, 151 out of 255 of students enrolled are biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of the faculty specializing in some subfield of biochemistry (biophysical, biochemical, bioorganic or medicinal chemistry). Since all of the biology majors and a large number of chemistry majors will be involved in learning and researching biologically related topics, we believe that linking the common concepts in biology and chemistry together will facilitate the understanding and relevance of the topics in General Chemistry and help students better integrate the two disciplines. To facilitate this process, we are analyzing the topics covered in General Chemistry I and II in order to determine which topics have biologically relevant examples that can be easily added to the curriculum without taking away from the chemistry department's mission as an American Chemical Society (ACS) certified program. The addition of biological examples and illustrations will help students make connections between the chemistry and biology. We hypothesize that adding biologically-related material will require the "weeding out" of some traditional topics which are no longer relevant, thus allowing a greater emphasis on the more relevant topics. This is the most recent addition to our action plan and is still in the infancy stages. Analysis of the Effect of Action Plan A ten year analysis of the 1151 course shows an increase from 239 students in 1998 to 361 students in 2008 (51% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 25.5% to 18.6%. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 1152 course shows an increase from 208 students in 1998 to 333 students in 2008 (60% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5% to 20.1% in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7%. The ACS scores are statistically the same. Most of the gains in DFW rates have occurred over the past 5 years. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentile or better. A ten year analysis of the 1211 course shows an increase from 497 students in 1998 to 779 students in 2008 (57% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 44.2% to 10.5%. The ACS scores are statistically the same (1211 was first given in 2001). A ten year analysis of the 1212 course shows an increase from 319 students in 1998 to 622 students in 2008 (95% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 34.2% to 11.4% in 2008. The department did see a decline in ACS scores when the initial RPG plan was implemented but the results over the past 2 years are statistically the same as in 1998. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department of Chemistry serves not only students who have declared chemistry as their major but also students in biology, for which general chemistry is a prerequisite for the first course in the biology major (Principles of Biology), physics, for which chemistry is a required minor and pre-medical students. In addition any major can use chemistry 1151/1152 or 1211/1212 as the laboratory sequence required by the University for graduation. This report addresses the efforts to increase retention in the courses which are used by both the chemistry and non-chemistry majors as part of the core curriculum (1151/1152, 1211/1212) and courses used by persons wishing to minor in chemistry (2400/3410). Introductory Courses “Many introductory science courses are responsible for driving away students who later return and become chemistry majors” (Reform in Undergraduate Science Teaching in the 21st Century). Because of the “turn off” factor of these 1000 and 2000 level courses one of the key factors that will affect retention is the number of students who receive a D, F or withdraw from the course. These students either are turned off by science and change majors or are forces to retake the course causing the department to offer more sections both of which are unfavorable outcomes. Over the past four years the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence believing those courses will affect the most people. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia's RPI initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RPI initiative allowed the department to attack the retention problem in three ways: the implementation of peer tutorials, weekly meetings between faculty members who teach the courses in order to discuss ideas, methods and problems in the various units and a redesign in the courses. In much the same way student learning (as shown through exit exams) will be improved as the retention is improved by the following programs. Peer Led Tutorials Peer led tutorials are an effective way to allow students to receive help and ask questions in a small group setting (25 as opposed to 100 – 200). Students enrolled in 1211, 1212, 2400 or 3410 can register for a tutorial which is led by either an chemistry student who has recently excelled in one of the courses or a graduate student. The grade for the course is based on class attendance and participation by the student. We have found that the tutorials have been moderately effective in the 1211 and 1212 sequences but less effective in the 2400 and 3410 sequence. The department is currently modifying the tutorials so that they are more interactive and students are required to work out problems on the board as the peer leader circulates throughout giving help where needed. We believe that this activity will more actively engage the student allowing him/her to work the problem on their own with hints from the leader. In addition the department is developing a book of "worked out" problems which students can download. Bi-Weekly Communication Weekly meetings between the faculty members who teach introductory courses were started initially with a senior faculty member who facilitated discussion on what materials in the text were more important and what topics should be less emphasized. Since most persons teaching the general chemistry sequence come in as visiting faculty and very little experience teaching except as a TA we found that there is a preconceived notion that everything in the text must be taught. Through these meetings the general chemistry faculty has been able to increase the depth of student knowledge rather than go for complete "coverage" of the text. In addition the faculty have exchanged ideas on how to teach different topics, discussed student misconceptions and developed slides which we can use as needed. It is often difficult to schedule these meetings around teaching schedules so this part of the action plan has been waning over the past semester, but we hope that we can continue this as part of the upcoming year's action plan. Course Redesign In the eight sections of CHEM1211 and CHEM1212, General Chemistry I and II in Spring 2009, 151 out of 255 of students enrolled are biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of the faculty specializing in some subfield of biochemistry (biophysical, bioanalytical, bioorganic or medicinal chemistry). Since all of the
biology majors and a large number of chemistry majors will be involved in learning and researching biologically related topics, we believe that linking the common concepts in biology and chemistry together will facilitate the understanding and relevance of the topics in General Chemistry and help students better integrate the two disciplines. To facilitate this process, we are analyzing the topics covered in General Chemistry I and II in order to determine which topics have biologically relevant examples that can be easily added to the curriculum without taking away from the chemistry department’s mission as an American Chemical Society (ACS) certified program. The addition of biological examples and illustrations will help students make connections between the chemistry and biology. We hypothesize that adding biologically-related material will require the “weeding out” of some traditional topics which are no longer relevant, thus allowing a greater emphasis on the more relevant topics. This is the most recent addition to our action plan and is still in the infancy stages. What changes has your department made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)?

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The department has found that there are very few problems in the 3000/4000 level courses. As such the emphasis will be placed on the 1000/2000/3000 level courses. We are redesigning courses and are in the process of adding on-line homework to our 1211/1212 and 2400/3410 sequences so that we can assess any changes in either exit test scores or student perceptions.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2008-2009 Chemistry MS**  
*As of 12/12/2016 03:35 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 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/intermentships/graduate and undergraduate stipends and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful is our teaching. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and the regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of association with the ACS is the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

**Goals**

**G 1: MS Program Goals**

The M.S. program's goal is to produce well trained professionals who possess a high level of proficiency in modern chemical techniques and knowledge of modern chemical problems.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Communication (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms. 2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content 3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology 5. Work effectively in group situations. 6. Students in the masters program must perform research and write a thesis or a non thesis paper detailing their work

**O/O 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1)**

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. Students will be able to apply theory learned in lecture courses to original research performed under the supervision of a faculty member.

O/O 3: Technology (M: 1)
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M1: Thesis / Project (O: 1, 2, 3)
All masters students are required to pass a general exam. This can be done via coursework or through testing.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Communication
80% pass their thesis defense on a first try.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
80% pass their thesis defense on their first attempt.

Target for O3: Technology
80% pass their thesis defense on their first attempt.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Chemistry PhD
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 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 qualified students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instruction program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for a productive career in post-graduate studies and for the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students to participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals/internships/graduate and undergraduate stipends and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful is our teaching. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and the regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of association with the ACS is the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

Goals

G1: Knowledge of chemistry
The Ph.D. program's goal is to produce chemists who possess a high level of proficiency in modern chemical techniques and knowledge of modern chemical problems.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Communication Skill (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.

O/O 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.

O/O 3: Technology (M: 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.

O/O 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.

O/O 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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 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 i.e. 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.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 2: 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 3: Seminar Class (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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

Continued Quality
Our goal is to continue excellence with our program’s growth.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 12
Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are adding new faculty and new research lines to accommodate growing interest, including our new Computational Chemistry program and Synthetic Organic Chemistry program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department has added a poster day in order to give master's and Ph.D. students another opportunity to demonstrate communication skills. We anticipated that 35% of all graduate students would use this opportunity to show their research. There were over 50 posters which exceeds the 35% which we anticipated. In addition new courses were developed in order to expand the knowledge base of our students these include metals in biology and medicine, nucleic acids and drug design, intermediate NMR, Advanced Synthetic and Mecanistic Organic Chemistry, Biomolecular NMR and Computational Chemistry.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We found the level of participation in the new classes and programs were greater than expected. This has encouraged to add new programs and new classes to the current slate. Our students participated in the Fall in the 7th Annual Biotechnology Symposium. The Department and program will continue to grow as new faculty and lecturers are hired, and new classes and programs will be added to the roster to meet the needs.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Communication Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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: Course Objectives for Speech 1000 (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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: Competent Speaker Measure (O: 1)**

Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 1177 students in fall 2008 and 931 students in spring 2009. 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 2009-2010 Assessment) should generate a more nuanced assessment of the Speech 1000 course and its development of oral competency skills.
M 2: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (O: 1)

In fall 2008 and spring 2009, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA-24 measure, producing 1177 scores in fall 2008 and 931 scores in spring 2009. As indicated in the four tables above, the overall mean score showed a slight decrease in students' communication apprehension: from 59.06032 to 57.67076 in fall 2008; and from 61.14393 to 57.74408 in spring 2009. More specifically, these sections demonstrated a slight decrease in apprehension for the public communication scale: dropping from 18.1011 to 17.50558 in fall 2008; and from 18.45113 to 17.06213 in spring 2009. 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 measurement indicate stronger support for the hypothesis that Speech 1000 strengthens students' oral competency by enhancing their confidence in a variety of communication situations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 3: Willingness to Communicate (O: 1)

In fall 2008 and spring 2009, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 1177 scores in fall 2008 and 931 scores in spring 2009. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2008 mean score indicated a small overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 193.2845 pre-test to 232.4648 post-test. In fall 2008, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 23.1645 to 24.18565 and from 55.30589 to 59.95912 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2008, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2009 results showed a slight increase in the willingness to communicate measure, from 188.9275 in the pre-test to 189.3239 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have made no changes to Speech 1000 in the past year. The data from our assessment report demonstrates success in both stated course objectives as they relate to the core curriculum: oral communication competency and reducing communication apprehension.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings from this year's assessment indicate that the changes to Speech 1000 that were implemented five years ago have successfully met the stated objectives for the course.
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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 2008-09 academic year there were 52 students enrolled in the program and 14 students graduated.

Goals
G 1: Meet Certification Requirements
CD Program graduates will meet national certification and state licensure requirements to be fully-certified.

G 2: Evidence Based Practice
CD Program graduates will be able to implement evidence-based services across the scope of practice in speech-language
pathology.

**G 3: Employment**

CD Program graduates will be sought and hired by employers throughout the state and the southeast.

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and disorders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Describe Communication &amp; Swallowing Processes (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can describe normal communication and swallowing processes and behaviors including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of speech, language, hearing, and communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders including anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 8, 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Evaluate Research Relevance (G: 1, 2) (M: 8, 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can critically evaluate published theory and research to determine its relevance and application to clinical practice in communication disorders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues (G: 1, 3) (M: 8, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards and practice guidelines, federal and state regulations, site-specific rules, service delivery models, and practice management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Outline Professional Credentials (G: 1) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can outline the requirements for state and national certification, specialty recognition, and licensure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills (G: 1, 3) (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates oral and written communication skills appropriate to professional practice in communication disorders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student accurately assesses clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders using formal and informal assessment procedures (including screening, prevention, and evaluation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student develops and implements intervention programs that are functional, logical in sequence, and effective in changing client behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities (G: 1, 3) (M: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and ethical behavior with clients, family members, and other professionals and is able to self-evaluate clinical performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Apply Technology (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 6, 7, 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student uses appropriate technology for clinical assessment and intervention and for professional productivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Understand Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders and adapts assessment, treatment, and prevention plans and procedures to meet the individual needs as well as the linguistic and cultural differences of each client.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Praxis II Exam (Total Score) (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students take the Praxis II Exam in speech-language pathology for national certification and state licensure prior to graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
90% of students will pass the Praxis II Exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students graduating during this period passed the Praxis II Exam on their first attempt. Scores ranged from 620 to 790 with an average score of 710.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: Praxis II Exam Category I Score (Comm Process) (O: 2, 14)
Score for Category I Basic Human Communication Processes.

### Target for O2: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; six within the average range; and seven above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O14: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; six within the average range; and seven above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.

### Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Nine students scored within the average range and five above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Nine students scored within the average range and five above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category III Speech Disorders.

### Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; eight scored within the average range; and five above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; eight scored within the average range; and five above average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 3, 4)
Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders.

### Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

79% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Three students scored below average; eight scored within the average range; and three above average.

### Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

79% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Three students scored below average; eight scored within the average range; and three above average.

### M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 3, 4, 13)

Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

### Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders

Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (6-7), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II Exam was 75%.

### Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention

Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (6-7), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II Exam was 75%.

### Target for O13: Apply Technology

Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (6-7), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II Exam was 75%.

### M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Management) (O: 4, 13)

Score for Category VI Clinical Management.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

### Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Eleven students scored within the average range and three above average.

### Target for O13: Apply Technology

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. Eleven students scored within the average range and three above average.

### M 8: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) (O: 5, 6, 7)

Score for Category VII Professional Issues, Psychometrics, Research.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

### Target for O5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; eight within the average range; and five above average.

### Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance

90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; eight within the average range; and five above average.

Target for O7: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues
90% of students will score within the national average performance range or above.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
93% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II Exam. One student scored below average; eight within the average range; and five above average.

M 9: Portfolio Section 1 (Prereq Knowledge) (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 that they have met the prerequisite requirements of the program.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.78 on this section of the portfolio with eleven students rated 4 and three students rated 3.

M 10: Portfolio Section 2 (Comm & Swallow Process) (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 describe the normal communication and swallowing processes.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.86 on this section of the portfolio with twelve students rated 4 and two students rated 3.

M 11: Portfolio Section 3 (Comm & Swallow Disord) (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 the etiologies and characteristics of communication and swallowing disorders.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.64 on this section of the portfolio with eleven students rated 4; one student rated 3; and two rated 2.

M 12: Portfolio Section 4 (Prin Assess & Interv) (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 discuss the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.43 on this section of the portfolio with ten students rated 4 and four students rated 2.

M 13: Portfolio Section 5 (Stds Ethical Conduct) (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 discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
### Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.71 on this section of the portfolio with nine students rated 4; four students rated 3; and one rated 2.

### M 14: Portfolio Section 6 (Eval Research) (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 demonstrate that they can critically evaluate published theory and research.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

#### Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance

Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.45 on this section of the portfolio with eight students rated 4; five rated 3; and one rated 1.

### M 15: Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) (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 demonstrate that they can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards, practice guidelines, and practice management.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

#### Target for O7: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Students achieved an average rating of 2.93 on this section of the portfolio with one student rated 4; 12 students rated 3; and one rated 1.

### M 16: Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials) (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 outline the requirements for national and state certification and licensure.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

#### Target for O8: Outline Professional Credentials

Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.57 on this section of the portfolio with eight students rated 4; and six rated 3.

### M 17: Portfolio Section 9 (Comm Skills) (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 document that they have appropriate oral and written communication skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

#### Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.21 on this section of the portfolio with four students rated 4; nine rated 3; and one rated 2.

### M 18: Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) (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 can accurately assess clients with communication disorders and swallowing disorders.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

#### Target for O10: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.64 on this section of the portfolio with ten students rated 4; three rated 3; and one
### M 19: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills - Interven) (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 demonstrate that they can develop and implement functional and effective intervention programs.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O11: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.50 on this section of the portfolio with nine students rated 4; three rated 3; and two rated 2.

### M 20: Portfolio Section 12 (Interpersonal Qual) (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 document that they have appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and are able to self-evaluate clinical performance.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O12: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.57 on this section of the portfolio with nine students rated 4; four rated 3; and one rated 2.

### M 21: Portfolio Section 13 (Apply Technology) (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 document that they can use appropriate technology for assessment, intervention, and professional productivity.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O13: Apply Technology**

Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.93 on this section of the portfolio with thirteen students rated 4 and one rated 3.

### M 22: Portfolio Section 14 (Ling & Cult Diversity) (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 their knowledge of linguistic and cultural issues related to communication and swallowing disorders.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O14: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.50 on this section of the portfolio with eight students rated 4; five rated 3; and one rated 2.

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

#### Neurogenic Disorders

Three of the 14 students scored below the national average range for the Neurogenic Disorders area of the Praxis II exam. The faculty will review the curriculum and course syllabi to ensure that these disorders are covered sufficiently.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord)
- **Outcome/Objective:** Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2009

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** CD Faculty
Neurogenic Disorders
Three of the 14 students scored below the national average range for the Neurogenic Disorders area of the Praxis II exam. The faculty will review the curriculum and course syllabi to ensure that these disorders are covered sufficiently.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disorder) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Neurogenic Disorders
Three of the 14 students scored below the national average range for the Neurogenic Disorders area of the Praxis II exam. The faculty will review the curriculum and course syllabi to ensure that these disorders are covered sufficiently.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disorder) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Portfolio Prof Issues
One student out of 14 scored a 1 on this section of her portfolio. The low rating on this section was the result of the student not following instructions and the portfolio guidelines. Her rating reduced the average to 2.93, just below the target of 3.0. Because this was a problem with a single student, no significant changes will be made in the portfolio process. All students will be reminded to follow the program portfolio guidelines.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues

Implementation Description: Fall 2009
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: CD Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The CD program will continue its curriculum review with increased focus on neurogenic disorders to ensure our students have the knowledge they need. We will also continue to keep students informed about the portfolio process and guidelines to keep them on target for successful completion of all portfolio sections. In addition to the on-going curriculum review, the CD Program will re-examine the measures of achievement to ensure they are giving us the most useful data possible. We anticipate continuing to meet all of our targets.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
During the past year, the CD program faculty continued its curriculum review making minor changes in course syllabi to enhance certain academic content areas. One area targeted for improvement last year was neurogenic disorders and the program offered a seminar during the summer to expand students' knowledge in this area. Students take 2-3 years to complete the graduate program so it will take time to see the effect of any changes made in the curriculum. All students passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt with the average score of 710 being well above the target of 600. This suggests that the overall curriculum enhancements made in previous years have been effective. The program will continue to focus on neurogenic disorders.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The findings from this year's assessment indicate that the CD program has been successful in graduating students who are knowledgeable and skilled in speech-language pathology. We were successful in meeting all but two targets. All students passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt, and all successfully completed their program portfolio. The assessment allowed us to identify an area for improvement in the curriculum (neurogenic disorders) that we will continue to address. It also highlighted the problem of using the portfolio ratings when a student may have the knowledge, but does not follow the guidelines for presenting it in the portfolio.
Goals

G 1: Scholarly or creative excellence
Produce students whose work demonstrates excellence in either scholarly or creative area.

G 2: Broad understanding of communications fields
Produce students who have a broad understanding of the various disciplines and interdisciplinary traditions that comprise the field of communication.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions (G: 2) (M: 3)
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.

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
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
The student’s research proposal should pose a significant research problem, should evidence awareness of historical and theoretical contexts surrounding the question, and should deploy appropriate methodologies for addressing the question. In the oral defense, the student should be able to articulately engage the questions of the committee members. Proposals for creative projects in film/video should go beyond the technical-logistical, and should present in detail the aesthetic sources and traditions out of which the student’s work is operating. Completed creative projects should evidence technical mastery of the means of media-making as well as aesthetic sophistication and artistic vision.

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
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Understanding of research methods (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)
Students should be conversant in the wide range of research methodologies of the interdisciplinary field of communication. They should demonstrate competence in specific research methods appropriate to their area of specialization.

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: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense (O: 2)
After the defense of the thesis prospectus, the examining committee should evaluate the project on a scale of 0 to 5, with 2 being a low pass and 5 representing a high pass. The evaluation should be delivered to the relevant area director.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
Proposals should be rated at least 4 (on a scale of 5).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
We have not yet settled on a procedure for implementing this data collection. This semester the Graduate Committee has
begun to devise an online system of tracking this data, which will be detailed in the action plan.

**M 2: Quality of creative or research thesis (O: 2)**

After the thesis defense, the committee members should evaluate the thesis on a 0 to 5 scale, with 2 representing mediocre but passable work, and 5 representing work of high distinction.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies**

Theses should be rated at least 4 (on a scale of 5).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

No findings. The measurement criteria and forms have not yet been developed.

**M 3: Quality of final theory papers (O: 1)**

The final papers in our required Comm 6010, Issues and Perspectives in Communication will be taken as evidence of a breadth of knowledge of the scholarly traditions in communication. Additionally, all film/video students are required to take Comm 6020, Advanced Film Theory; the overall performance in this course will be taken to assess the student’s knowledge of the aesthetic and theoretical traditions related to the study of moving images.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions**

All students should score an 84% (B) or higher in final papers in our required Comm 6010, Issues and Perspectives in Communication. Additionally, all film/video students should score an 84% or higher grade overall in our required (for film/video only) Comm 6020, Advanced Film Theory.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 23 students taking Comm 6010, 20 scored a B or higher on the final paper. Three students (or 13%) failed to reach this level, in Comm 6020 (Advanced Film Theory), 3 of 4 students earned a B or higher (75%). This data is not representative, however, as the incoming class of film-video students this year was unusually small, so the sample is skewed.

**M 4: Quality of final methods project (O: 3)**

Generally, the final project in our required course Comm 6030, Research Methods, is a mock research proposal, which gives the student training in producing the kind of document which will be required for the thesis prospectus.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Understanding of research methods**

The grade for the final research proposal in the required course Comm 6030, Research Methods, should fall between 84 and 100 (B or higher).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

In Comm 6030 Research Methods, 9 out of 12 students earned a B or higher, which means that 25% of our students did not successfully meet our goal. This result is perhaps reflected in other, more anecdotal data: for example, it appears that some of our MA students are taking an inordinate amount of time to complete the thesis prospectus. We plan to inaugurate next semester a 1-hour prospectus workshop for MA and PhD students working on prospectuses, which is detailed in the action plan.

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

**Begin Prospectus Workshop**

We have begun an annual prospectus workshop in Fall 09. MA students who are finishing coursework within the year or who are planning to write theses should enroll in this one-credit workshop.

**Established in Cycle: 2008-2009**

**Implementation Status: In-Progress**

**Priority: High**

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

- **Measure:** Quality of final methods project
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of research methods

**Projected Completion Date: 08/2009**

**Responsible Person/Group:** Mary Stuckey. Graduate faculty.

**Develop Assessment Form for Creative Thesis**

**Established in Cycle: 2008-2009**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**

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

- **Measure:** Quality of creative or research thesis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written, oral, and media-making competencies

**Develop Assessment form for Research Thesis**

**Established in Cycle: 2008-2009**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**
Develop Assessment Form for Thesis Prospectus

Initially, our plan was to develop a simple form which will measure the student's level of competence in the various criteria outlined in the "Objectives" section of this report. At the end of a prospectus defense, the members of the committee would fill out these forms, and they would be filed and would exist solely for assessment purposes. We are still working on this form, as Thesis Prospectuses present unique challenges in terms of measurement. The Prospectus is necessarily an "imperfect" document; we expect there to be theoretical and/or methodological issues which it is the purpose of the Prospectus defense to help the student to resolve. Thus, the prospectus assessment form will need to take this into consideration. One way to do this would be to ask the examiners to assess how adept the student was, during oral defense, at thinking through the issues raised by committee members during the defense.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

---

Incorporate more opportunities for revisions in core courses

In the core theory-oriented courses (6010 and 6020) we should incorporate more opportunities for revisions of written work. These can be connected to shorter written assignment which focus on specific analytic or research skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

---

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

For the issues described above, some action-plan items can be developed immediately; while others, larger in scope, would best wait until after the self-study of the department is completed. These latter would include larger curriculum changes related to methods, course requirements, and the possibility of turning the Film-Video production MA into an MFA. In the meantime, we have just begun our prospectus writing workshop which is designed for any MA or PhD student who wishes to have a structured path through the prospectus-writing process. We have also developed more accurate assessment forms for the research and creative thesis defenses.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Three action-plan items were indicated in the Weave report of 07-08 for the MA program. The first indicated a need for a way of assessing the quality of MA theses and defenses, when we have a program which produces fundamentally different types of theses, from the scholarly to the aesthetic/creative. We have just implemented two thesis reporting forms developed by A. Restivo (whose background incorporates both scholarship and creative film writing/production). The forms are specific to the type of thesis being evaluated; and all faculty will be required to use these to assess thesis quality at the end of a defense. Another involved MA curriculum revisions. We have begun teaching some of the new courses added to the curriculum. Larger changes--such as in reorganization of the core theory and methods requirements or implementation of the MFA for media production--are on hold while the department goes through the self-study process. Recruitment remains an issue. We were able in Fall of 09 to bring in an exceptionally strong MA class--especially in the area of Film/Video Production, which has in the past been plagued by an insufficient number of high-quality applications. Work on the website and on publicity material remains a high priority.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The quality of the work of our MA students remains generally high, with a number of our MA students taking an inordinate amount of time moving from coursework completion to thesis prospectus. Strategies for dealing with this issue will be discussed in #3 below.
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.

Goals

G 1: To produce PhDs highly skilled in research
The areas of Public Communication and Moving Image Studies are both highly interdisciplinary, drawing on a broad range of theoretical and intellectual traditions. We would like our PhDs to frame research questions with full understanding of their positioning within this broad discursive matrix, while at the same time having highly developed research skills specific to their research questions.

G 2: To produce excellent undergraduate teachers
We seek to produce PhDs with demonstrated teaching excellence in the undergraduate classroom, both at the level of the introductory or survey course and in higher-level courses related to their research projects.

G 3: To foster academic professionalism
We strive to produce PhDs with significant professional experience, including presentation at conferences in their area (Public Communication or Moving Image Studies), professional interaction with leading scholars in their areas of research, publication in journals, and service activities in the graduate student caucuses of the professional organizations in their area.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Research proficiency (G: 1) (M: 1)
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).

SLO 2: Proficiency in communication theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)
Demonstrated ability to comprehend and engage 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.

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
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Competence in oral and written communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)
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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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

SLO 4: Teaching excellence (G: 2) (M: 2)
Demonstrated excellence in teaching courses in both the introductory courses in the field and in the student`s areas of specialization.

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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 5: Professional development (G: 3) (M: 1, 4)
Students are expected to regularly present their work at the professional conferences in the field, and to regularly submit written work for publication. Students are also encouraged to take an active role in the graduate student caucuses of the professional...
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

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Final papers in doctoral seminars (O: 1, 2, 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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Research proficiency

Because of the varying levels of previous training among students in a doctoral seminar (depending on the student=s year in the program, the student=s previous MA training, etc.), it is unrealistic to expect a 100 percent level. We would like to see a level of about 75%.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

A total of 203 papers were submitted in doctoral seminars this academic year. Of these, 153 received a grade of A-minus or higher. This represents a 75% achievement of a grade of 90 or above on a 100-pt scale. If we omit the A-minus and only count solidly A-level work, we find that 94 papers, or 47%, reach this level. If we were to take the first percentage as representing work that was of near-publishable quality, then our goal will have been met. However, our experience-- performance on comprehensive exams, and level of publication among grad students-- tells us that this would not be an accurate representation of the quality of student writing. Thus, the A-minus grade should not be taken to represent even near-publishable quality work. Since these are grades on the paper, and not grades for the seminar as a whole, the situation suggests an action-item that the graduate faculty take up, whether the A-minus is being given out too liberally for the final paper. If this is the case, part of the explanation may lie in the fact that, because of action items in past years which have encouraged the faculty to incorporate more revision in the final paper process in doctoral seminars, faculty may feel that they should grade on progress made rather than objective assessment of publishability. In any case, this year 14 of our 23 doctoral seminars had revision opportunities for final papers built into the seminar. Twelve of the 23 seminars required formal, conference-style presentation of (a version of) the paper.

Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

A total of 203 papers were submitted in doctoral seminars this academic year. Of these, 153 received a grade of A-minus or higher. This represents a 75% achievement of a grade of 90 or above on a 100-pt scale. If we omit the A-minus and only count solidly A-level work, we find that 94 papers, or 47%, reach this level. If we were to take the first percentage as representing work that was of near-publishable quality, then our goal will have been met. However, our experience-- performance on comprehensive exams, and level of publication among grad students-- tells us that this would not be an accurate representation of the quality of student writing. Thus, the A-minus grade should not be taken to represent even near-publishable quality work. Since these are grades on the paper, and not grades for the seminar as a whole, the situation suggests an action-item that the graduate faculty take up, whether the A-minus is being given out too liberally for the final paper. If this is the case, part of the explanation may lie in the fact that, because of action items in past years which have encouraged the faculty to incorporate more revision in the final paper process in doctoral seminars, faculty may feel that they should grade on progress made rather than objective assessment of publishability. In any case, this year 14 of our 23 doctoral seminars had revision opportunities for final papers built into the seminar. Twelve of the 23 seminars required formal, conference-style presentation of (a version of) the paper.

Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication

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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

A total of 203 papers were submitted in doctoral seminars this academic year. Of these, 153 received a grade of A-minus or higher. This represents a 75% achievement of a grade of 90 or above on a 100-pt scale. If we omit the A-minus and only count solidly A-level work, we find that 94 papers, or 47%, reach this level. If we were to take the first percentage as representing work that was of near-publishable quality, then our goal will have been met. However, our experience-- performance on comprehensive exams, and level of publication among grad students-- tells us that this would not be an accurate representation of the quality of student writing. Thus, the A-minus grade should not be taken to represent even near-publishable quality work. Since these are grades on the paper, and not grades for the seminar as a whole, the situation suggests an action-item that the graduate faculty take up, whether the A-minus is being given out too liberally for the final paper. If this is the case, part of the explanation may lie in the fact that, because of action items in past years which have encouraged the faculty to incorporate more revision in the final paper process in doctoral seminars, faculty may feel that they should grade on progress made rather than objective assessment of publishability. In any case, this year 14 of our 23 doctoral seminars had revision opportunities for final papers built into the seminar. Twelve of the 23 seminars required formal, conference-style presentation of (a version of) the paper.
Target for O5: Professional development
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%.

M 2: Student teaching evaluations (O: 4)
Students are expected to receive student evaluations of at least 4 out of 5, to create syllabi which reflect the most up-to-date scholarship in the area the course covers, and to have grade distributions appropriate for their course.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Teaching excellence
All students are expected to receive average student evaluations of their teaching that fall between 4 and 5.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Overall, we find that graduate student performance as graduate instructors is excellent. Data for the Fall 08 semester shows that of the 72 course sections taught by our graduate students, 56 (77.7%) had a #17 score of 4.0 or greater. Of the 33 graduate students who taught for us, 28 (84.8%) had at least one #17 score of 4.0 or greater. The discrepancy between the two percentages suggests that one or more of our graduate assistants will have had uneven performance in the two sections or courses taught that semester.

M 3: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 2, 3)
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.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O2: Proficiency in communication theory
All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, ideally on the first attempt.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Eight of our doctoral students took comprehensive examinations this academic year. Of these, two failed the written examination and must retake the examination next year. Additionally, two other students failed only one area of the four. These students were given the opportunity to perform a make-up examination of the area, and in both cases, the make-up examination and oral examinations following were passing. While these percentages of failures on all or part of the comprehensives might be seen as the sign of the intellectual rigor of the doctoral program, we nevertheless find this level unacceptable. There is, in fact, a discrepancy between performance on final seminar papers and subsequent performance on the comprehensive exams that needs to be address in the action plan.

M 4: Publications and conference papers (O: 3, 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 those are carefully discussed so that ongoing plans of study are matching actual accomplishment.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication
All doctoral students are expected to present, minimally, one conference paper per year (after the first year in the program), and to publish at least one article before defending the dissertation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
In all, our doctoral students presented 52 papers at conferences in the last academic year. Our students are highly visible at the two national/international conferences associated with the program=s two areas: the NCA (National Communication Association) and SCMS (Society for Cinema and Media Studies). One of our students won top paper award at the national NCA conference; while two others received top paper awards at the southern regional conference connected to NCA. Seven of our students presented at the National Council of Black Studies conference; in fact, three of our students in Moving Image Studies organized a panel for this conference. Additionally, our students have been highly visible at smaller, boutique
details of action plans for this cycle (by established cycle, then alpha)

**Enhance recruitment of doctoral students**
We feel that the programs are not getting as many outstanding applications as we would like to get, and we are sometimes loosing our best accepted students to competing programs at other institutions. We feel that part of the reason we do not have as large an applicant pool as we would like has to do with the visibility of the programs. Thus, a variety of publicity strategies need to be developed and implemented to get the word out on our doctoral programs.

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and conference papers</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate directors, Chair, Area faculty.

**Additional Resources:** Increased web design time.

**Increased opportunity to revise written work**
Currently, slightly over 50% of our doctoral seminars incorporate paper revision into the seminar. We would like to encourage faculty to adopt this practice more widely. One of the systems we would advocate is to have the students present short versions of the final paper orally to the seminar as a conference presentation, and then use the resulting feedback to revise the paper for final submission. This is already done in some seminars; we would like to see it more widely adopted in doctoral syllabi.

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive doctoral examinations</td>
<td>Competence in oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final papers in doctoral seminars</td>
<td>Competence in oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate directors, Chair, Area faculty.

**Additional Resources:**

**Institute prospectus writing workshop**
In Fall 2009, we began to offer a prospectus writing workshop for all students who had completed coursework (whether or not they had taken comps yet). We believe that this workshop will not only help doctoral students avoid the post-comprehensive-exams "doldrums," which often drag out the period during which the prospectus is written; but that it will also help the student in the publication process, as the completed prospectus can serve as a kind of template for planning which areas of the dissertation would be best suitable for sending out for publication during the writing process.

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and conference papers</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrate Center for Teaching/Learning feedback into grad teaching**
Beginning this semester, our two undergraduate Film core courses (which are the entry-level courses for new graduate GTAs to teach) have incorporated Center for Teaching and Learning feedback sessions early in the semester. We should adopt this in all of our large undergraduate core courses (those which have course directors), so as to provide new GTAs with feedback early. We should also encourage more of our experienced GTAs teaching stand-alone courses to utilize this resource.

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching evaluations</td>
<td>Teaching excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More faculty observation of student teaching

We are planning to have all GTAs be observed at least once per academic year by a faculty mentor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student teaching evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Teaching excellence

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010

Online course-by-course tracking of doctoral student progress

In order to be able to track doctoral student learning outcomes individually, and after each semester of coursework, we are planning to initiate an online tracking system which will be filled out for all doctoral student attending seminars. The instructors will be required to fill out a brief form for each student, at the time the instructor submits final grades for the seminar. At the end of last academic year, the Graduate Committee assigned to a subcommittee of members familiar with data tracking [Holley Wilkin and Ann Williams] the task of devising a system which would allow us to track online more detailed information than the final grade for every doctoral student attending seminars. In this way, we will be able to get a better picture of A/ the student's understanding of the foundational theoretical frameworks of the field; B/ the student's ability to present complex ideas orally; C/ the student's overall writing ability; and D/ the quality of the final paper (with publishability being the criterion of excellence in this category). Currently, the Graduate Committee has approved a final version of a short questionnaire to track the above information, and the subcommittee is now working to implement an online system for gathering and storing this information. We expect that the online system will be in place by the end of Fall semester 2009. Obviously, a system like this will need to be refined as we develop it, and so we imagine that it will be a work-in-progress at least until the end of Spring semester 2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
- Measure: Final papers in doctoral seminars | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
- Measure: Proficiency in communication theory | Research proficiency

Implementation Description: We plan to have an initial online system set up by the end of Fall 2009. However, this is a somewhat complex set of variables we are measuring, and we imagine that revisions and improvements to the online tracking system will continue at least through Spring 2010.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee.

Revised doctoral proseminar curriculum

At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new proseminar format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosem at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the proseminar will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final papers in doctoral seminars | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
- Measure: Proficiency in communication theory | Research proficiency
- Measure: Publications and conference papers | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
- Professional development

Implementation Description: We have already begun the new proseminar format; we will monitor its effectiveness during the year.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

To address the writing issues, we have already instituted a prospectus writing workshop, and have revised the doctoral proseminar to give the students examples of cutting-edge research questions in the field, and strategies for writing about them. The Graduate Committee has also begun collecting from faculty members innovative seminar writing assignments which we will be able to circulate to all graduate faculty as a resource guide. A related but larger issue concerns the need for more on-going assessment tracking of doctoral student progress. At present, a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee is developing (with faculty input on measurement criteria) an online form which will measure student levels of achievement in key areas, for every course taken. Faculty teaching doctoral seminars will be required to fill out this form for each student when submitting final grades. Enhancing our recruitment of doctoral students remains a pressing issue. It is complex insofar as it involves such issues as website development, publicity material development, etc. Some of our graduate track areas have developed a presence on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. However, as a recent article in Inside Higher Education pointed out, despite the proliferation of higher-ed institutions on social networking sites, the department's website remains the foundation of recruiting efforts. Currently, our web development has been scattered among several faculty (only one of whom can actually produce websites, and all of whom are doing this work on their own time), a few graduate assistants, and a part-time staff person; this has led to inadequate results, compared to comparable program websites elsewhere.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In last year’s action plan, one of the larger areas of attention was that of student writing and its assessment. On the one hand, we continued to have an increasingly high percentage of graduate work being presented at national and international conferences; yet there was a feeling that this was not matched by student publication placements or prospectus and dissertation defenses. To address this issue, we have instituted a number of changes: one, we eliminated the annual department conference (which simply duplicated the conference experience that the students were already getting anyway), and substituted for that a revamped doctoral proseminar, focused less on survival skills and more on substantive current research in the field. We’ve also initiated what promises to be a very successful prospectus writing workshop, which students can take in the year they are doing comprehensive exams. This should accelerate the time period from exams to dissertation writing stage. A closely related issue was the assessment of student performance, especially in the area of writing the completed article. Last year, this was connected to action plans relating to improved assessment of student defenses on comprehensive exams, and encouraging more opportunities for student revision of written work. The Graduate Committee has recently instituted a form for the evaluation of performances on prospectus defenses; and a number of doctoral seminars have incorporated in various ways opportunities for revision of written work. However, the assessment tracking of doctoral students takes on a broader scope in this year’s findings, and therefore other, related action items will be presented in response to #2 and #3 below. Overall the level of teaching among our GTAs is extremely high. Still, we are endeavoring to expand the opportunities for constructive evaluation of student teaching; thus, this year we began to use CTL sessions for those GTAs teaching breakouts in our gateway courses in the majors. Finally, recruitment of new graduate students was identified as a problem, and it continues to be a major area for action in this year’s cycle. This issue will be addressed in the responses below.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Once again, in this year’s findings, we see a high level of graduate student achievement at the conference paper level, which we feel is not matched by either publication record or performance on the doctoral comprehensive exams. This led to discussions about assessment of doctoral student performance more evenly throughout their coursework and comp period; the graduate committee is thus working to develop this assessment material and put it into implementation as soon as possible (details in #3 below). It is also tied to curriculum decisions related to collection of classroom strategies for improving student writing. Recruitment of doctoral applicants remains an extremely high priority, as we do not have the numbers of qualified applicants to give us the kind of range that we would like in selecting our incoming classes. This is a complex action item insofar as it needs to be broken down into several sub-action-items. As these are implementation strategies, they will be discussed in #3 below.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Computer Information Systems MBA
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
In today’s highly competitive global environment, the effective deployment of information technology has become the key to organizational success. There is a continuing shortage of individuals with the combination of business and technology skills needed to develop and manage information systems that provide competitive advantage in the global marketplace. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete. In many respects these applications are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The mission of the M.B.A. concentration and major in information systems is to produce graduates able to fill this need. Students will learn how to combine their general business knowledge with contemporary and emerging information systems concepts to enable organizations to compete strongly in the global marketplace. The courses to constitute a concentration (12 semester hours) in information systems are chosen from the 8000-level offerings of the Department of Computer Information Systems or IB 8680. This flexibility enables students to select courses that provide the best foundation for their career advancement. The M.B.A. IS enrollment over the 2008-2009 academic year was used to identify the specific courses for this assessment. Based on highest registration, the selected courses were CIS 8000 IT Project Management, CIS 8010 Business Process Innovation & Organizational Change Management, CIS 8020 Systems Integration, and CIS 8080 Security and Privacy. Indeed, these are logical extensions of the overall MBA program. Businesses need to continually innovate. This typically requires employing IT enabled business process reengineering and careful management of organizational change and of the overall innovation project. Finally, security and privacy are evermore important to maintain integrity and trust in this highly connected business environment.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Build and renew business via technology and process (M: 1)

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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
**O/O 2: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 2)**

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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 3)**

Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (M: 4)**

The student will be able to employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. This includes: Define the objectives of and issues associated integration of information systems applications. Explain alternative strategies for systems integration. Identify commonly used tools for integrating information systems, describing the benefits of using each. Explain how Web services can aid in systems integration, identifying the underlying tools and technologies that facilitate the creation of such services. Discuss the characteristics of systems integration projects, emphasizing the management issues and practices associated with them. Identify information systems application and organization characteristics that are most likely to cause an organization to employ a systems integration company to carry out the project work.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by IT, and manage the required change (O: 1)**

Students will be able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the required organizational changes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Build and renew business via technology and process**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the midterm and final exams in CIS 8010. Learning Objective: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty rating of 2.17/3.0. 100% met the standard.

**M 2: Manage projects and balance resources (O: 2)**

Manage projects and balance resources

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Manage projects and balance resources**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8000. Learning Objective: translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Fail to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were not able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Written Assignments Score: 2.5/3.0. 100% of students at or above the 2.0 rating.
M 3: Understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. (O: 3)

Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

75% of students achieved a score of 2 or higher. The score average was 2.125.

M 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (O: 4)

Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8020. Learning Objective: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were not able to accurately employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty rating of 2.5/3.0. 100% of students met 2.0 criterion.

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

**Review Course Content and Assignments**

Since the criterion was minimally met, the CIS Associate Chair (on behalf of the CIS GPC) will review the CIS 8020 course content and assignments with the current instructor and appropriate CIS faculty. The goal is to insure rigor of assignments.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions.
- Outcome/Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** CIS Associate Chair and CIS GPC

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty teaching this security and privacy course will collaborate to consider how to improve student success in achieving the related objective.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is the first year for assessment for this concentration. Therefore, no changes since last year’s action plan. Based on this year’s assessment, we will gather student work for analysis earlier in the academic year to avoid any potential loss due to course management system changes. Otherwise, courses, objectives, and measures seem good.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will be able to investigate, define, document and analyze an existing information system including the capability to solve complex organizational problems. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be...

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Computer Information Systems BBA**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application of information technology to organizational functions has shifted from supplanting basic operational tasks to the evolution of an intelligent information infrastructure which supports knowledge-workers within the organization as well as customers of the organization. Underlying these changes is an ever more rapidly developing technology with dramatically changing economics, pushing the envelope of what is possible and desirable. In this environment of dynamic and pervasive technology development and diffusion, the mission of the BBA-CIS program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business and technical knowledge with the latest software development tools and techniques to create information systems that will meet the needs of tomorrow's organizations. Number of graduates from this BBA CIS degree program this academic year: Summer 2008 11 Fall 2008 24 Spring 2009 21 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2008 211 Fall 2008 399 Spring 2009 423 Previous academic year graduates: Summer 2007 6 Fall 2007 13 Spring 2008 17 The number of students in this program major during previous academic year: Summer 2007 145 Fall 2007 309 Spring 2008 345 General approach As part of the ongoing assessment of our CIS BBA program, the CIS department has leveraged the CIS 4980 &quot;Capstone&quot; course. Students in this required course are assigned to real world organizations for the purpose of exercising the full range of topics from the CIS undergraduate core courses. Since these are real world environments, the needs of specific organizations may not cover all topics. See the CIS assessment plan at <a href="http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RCB/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm">http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RCB/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm</a>. CIS has developed a survey to gain structured and free form feedback from individuals involved with CIS 4980 &quot;Capstone&quot; projects. Use of this survey began in Spring 2005 (although we have project materials from several earlier semesters as well as informal feedback and observations from students and faculty). The form used in this Capstone survey appears at <a href="http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/C___GSU_assessment_CISBBACapstoneSurveyForm05052008.pdf">http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/C___GSU_assessment_CISBBACapstoneSurveyForm05052008.pdf</a>. At the end of each semester, the CIS 4980 teams present their projects to fellow students, faculty, and clients. Each of these viewers (excluding students) is asked to complete a survey for each team's presentation. Students' are asked to complete the survey to comment on their own performance and on their level of preparation to perform within each of the areas on the survey. And, there are areas for &quot;open&quot; comments. Clients may complete the survey based on their observations of the team's work and their presentation at the client's site. The survey's areas cover the full range of primary objectives of the courses within the CIS undergraduate core (and also within most electives). In particular, we can map the areas back to the CIS courses and measure whether scores are increasing (hopefully reflecting continuing improvement in the conduct of the associated courses and the in resulting student learning).</td>
<td>G 1: CIS BBA Program Goals</td>
<td>SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will become better problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking; students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline; students will be well prepared for positions in the discipline.</td>
<td>Students will be able to investigate, define, document and analyze an existing information system including the capability to solve complex organizational problems. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze real-world organizational needs will be...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to specify the requirements for a replacement system. Within the context of a capstone course, the quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by the client organizations. The quality of specifications developed by students will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Technology

**SLO 2: Students will be proficient in systems design (M: 5, 6, 9, 10)**

Students will be able to read a system specification and analyze user data requirements within the context of a three-tier architecture. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to analyze user requirements for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to presentation tier, business tier, and data tier abstractions. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design current systems architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to model and develop a design for a web-based application. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to make effective and efficient use of Internet applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

7 Technology

**SLO 3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency (M: 7, 8, 11)**

Students will be able to read a program specification using unified modeling language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to design, code, test and document an object-oriented program in an object-oriented programming language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: 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 technology directions as well as providing an ever-stronger foundation 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 (O: 1)**

Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis**

4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

4.38

**M 2: Specified System Requirements (O: 1)**

Specified, analyzed, & refined the system and user requirements

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis**

4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)</th>
<th>4.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</th>
<th>4.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Developed Architecture (O: 2)</th>
<th>3.97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Designed programs (O: 2)</th>
<th>4.21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Coded and Developed (O: 3)</th>
<th>4.44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded/developed the specified &amp; designed programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 3)</th>
<th>3.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 9: Developed implementation plans (O: 2)
Developed implementation plans
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
3.91

M 10: Designed user interface (O: 2)
Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
4.05

M 11: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 3)
 Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
4.11

M 12: Enrollment in CIS BBA upper division courses (O: 4)
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.
Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Target for O4: CIS Enrollments**
Achieve a rolling-three-year average annual increase of 15% in number of CIS majors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Using Statware Report 6000 and looking at fall semesters for each year, this target is achieved. Year Majors Fall Semesters Year to Year Increase 2006 259 2007 309 19.31% 2008 399 29.13%

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

**Clarify use of OO concepts**
We will investigate whether this results from the projects not requiring this or the students and clients think that this use is not well-understood and changes in the program are required. Note that this is very close to 4.0.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems analysis

- **Implementation Description:** We will emphasize / emphasized that the question only applied to projects that included OO concepts...
  - Student confusion cleared up.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CIS UPC

**Implementation Planning**
We will investigate whether this results from the projects not requiring this or the students and clients think that this use is not well-understood and changes in the program are required. Note that this is very close to 4.0.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Developed implementation plans | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems design

- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2010
**OO Programming**

We will investigate whether this results from the projects not requiring this or the students and clients think that this use is not well-understood and changes in the program are required. Note that this is very close to 4.0.

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Appropriately used an object-oriented programming
- **Outcome/Objective:** Object Oriented Programming Proficiency

**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** CIS UPC

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will review the results of the analyses described in answers to academic questions one and two to determine whether any course changes are required. This review will be considered by the CIS UPC to determine the best path forward.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We are identifying more diverse projects that more closely align with students’ programs of study. We will add a paragraph to the end of the course survey to clarify how to score questions when the topic of the question was not part of that student’s project.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We must review the survey and survey results (or refine the survey) to determine if students are really not as strong in system analysis skills or whether the students are interpreting this as a weakness when in fact the project client/sponsor has changed the requirements in a fashion outside the student’s control (whether they are skillful in systems analysis or not). If this proves to be in fact be a student weakness in conduction system analysis and capturing system requirements, then we will review course content and conduct.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We changed the way that teams are formed in the CIS 4980 capstone course. Before Fall 2009, teams were self-formed. Prior to the new CIS curriculum, all CIS students took the same CIS courses except for one elective. All projects were software development projects. So, almost any selection of teams would have the proper knowledge set. With the new CIS curriculum, there is a substantially greater diversity of knowledge among the students when they enter this projects course. This produced suboptimal composition sufficient to limit team success. Beginning in Fall 2009, students express preferences for projects and team members but the instructor makes the final selections to insure a better match between projects requirements and team backgrounds. Students are still challenged by the projects to learn far beyond the curriculum contents. The results of this change in project team formation technique are not yet known but should appear in next year’s assessment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Our finding indicate that we have two new partially met areas to address. We will verify that these close scores are not a result of survey interpretation. And, we will provide feedback about these areas to the relevant course instructors to improve student preparation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will revisit the assessment areas each semester to determine if these changes are working. We expect that we can move at least two of the three partially met areas into the met classification in time for next year’s assessment review.
**Mission / Purpose**

The effective deployment of information technology is one of the keys to business success. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete in an increasingly interconnected global economy. In many respects these applications and technologies are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The CIS Graduate Program aims to develop specialists and managers with the combination of business and technology skills needed to continue competitive advancement of American industry. The mission of the CIS major in the Master of Science program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business knowledge with the latest software engineering tools and techniques to create and manage information systems that allow organizations to compete in the global marketplace.


**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology (M: 1)**

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs. This objective is not met in the core courses. In lieu of this, a surrogate objective will be used: Students will be able to select appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques and to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. The student should be able to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

**SLO 2: Create environments for programs and systems (M: 2)**

Students will be able to work with edge tools and techniques and to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. Students will be able to select appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques and to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. The student should be able to analyze an organization’s performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

**SLO 3: Manage an information technology project (M: 3, 4)**

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 4: Build and renew business via technology & process (M: 5, 6, 7)**

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.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: III.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

The course instructor neglected to both assign individual-level projects in his course and save these assignments for assessment purposes. As a result of this failure to follow designated assessment procedures, the results are: Average Score: data not available Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: data not available Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: data not available

#### M 2: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure (O: 2)

Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Create environments for programs and systems**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

This learning objective was assessed through a combination of student assignments in three related core courses (CIS 8020, 8040, and 8070). The data for the first course (CIS 8020) reflect that students are meeting the target; conversely, data for the remaining two courses (CIS 8040 and CIS 8070) indicate problems with faculty members’ adherence to the assessment procedures (in the case of CIS 8070) or in providing individual-level student assignments that are directly related to the course objectives (in the case of CIS 8040). Taken as a whole, these results indicate that the targets are only partially met.

#### M 3: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan (O: 3)

Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Average Score: 2.0 (where “2” indicates “meets the standard”). Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: 100.0% Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: 0.0%

#### M 4: III.2: Manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques (O: 3)

Students will be able to manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Average Score: 2.33 (where “2” indicates “meets the standard”). Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: 100.0% Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: 33.3%

#### M 5: IV.1: Identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies (O: 4)

Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**

Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve
“level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- Average Score: 2.15 (where “2” indicates “meets the standard”). Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: 87.5%
- Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: 37.5%

### M 6: IV.2: Diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations (O: 4)

Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations enabled by information technology.

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the target”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the target”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- Average Score: 2.15 (where “2” indicates “meets the standard”). Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: 100.0%
- Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: 25.0%

### M 7: IV.3: Formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology (O: 4)

Students should be able to formulate an implementation plan to manage organizational changes associated with introduction of new technology.

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**
Three facets of assessing achievement: 1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale 2) 80% of students will achieve “level 2” (“meets the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the standard”), according to the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- Average Score: 2.20 (where “2” indicates “meets the standard”). Ratio of students scoring 2 or above on 3-point scale: 100.0%
- Ratio of students scoring 3 or above on 3-point scale: 25.0%

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

**Course instructor should follow assessment procedures**
Course instructor responsible for teaching CIS 8030 must assign individual-level projects that reflect the course objectives. In addition, the course instructor must save copies of all M.S. individual student deliverables and make them available to the assessment coordinator.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system | Outcome/Objective: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course instructor for CIS 8030

**Offer all core courses yearly; require course instructors to assign student projects that reflect course objectives.**
There are 3 components of the action plan related to this learning objective. 1) Offer all required core courses on a yearly basis (to remedy the problem that CIS 8050 has not been offered for more than two years, and that faculty assisting in the assessment process have had to assess materials from a different course that students were permitted to substitute for CIS 8050). 2) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must assign individual-level student assignments that reflect the course objectives. 3) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must save all M.S. student deliverables from their courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure | Outcome/Objective: Create environments for programs and systems
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course instructors who teach CIS 8040, 8050, and 8070.

**Train assessors to allow for greater variability in student scores**
The only portion of the target goal that was not achieved for objective III.1 was the last part, which specifies a goal of having 25% or more of assessed students scoring at the level of "3" ("exceeds the standard"). In this case, all of the assessed students (n=8) were scored as "2" (which means that 0% of students were assessed as scoring a "3"). One contributing factor may be that course assessors have not been trained to discriminate between higher or lower scores. The Assessment coordinator will provide additional detailed criteria for participating assessors to use when performing the assessment. With the exception of this detail, all other target
objectives were met.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan
Outcome/Objective: Manage an information technology project

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment coordinator

---
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**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.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Student productivity**
- Students will be comfortable and competent in a setting which requires the use of computers.
- Students will be productive using various computer applications, for example, they will be able to produce reports, graphs, spreadsheets, charts, and slide shows.

---

**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 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

**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
- 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**
Proper curves should be generated for charts with appropriate labels

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**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 2008-2009 - 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2008-2009 - 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.
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2008-2009 - 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Generate documents
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Spreadsheet Application Software

### 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Generate documents
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Word Processing Application Software

### 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Formatting slides
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Presentation Application Software

### 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Chart drawing
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Spreadsheet Application Software

**Coordinate 1010 sections**

Establish a coordinator for the CSC 1010 course. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors teaching sections of the CSC 1010 course in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The Undergraduate Curriculum committee has realized that an issue with the CSC 1010 course is that it is typically taught by GTAs. As a result, many of the GTAs are teaching this course for the first time. The committee intends to assign a coordinator for the course who will oversee all sections being offered in order to ensure consistency among all the sections.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department has recommended to instructors of the CSC 1010 course to make sure to include extra examples of working with charts and importing figures. This has consistently been an issue with some of the students.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Undergraduate Curriculum committee intend to review the lecture materials for the CSC 1010 course. From the findings it seems as if there may not be enough examples or a thorough discussion in class about importing figures, charts, and/or diagrams into various applications.

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

**Mission / Purpose**

MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Computer Science BS goals**

Students will become better solvers of computational problems; Students will improve abilities to computationally model real world problems; Students will gain knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career applying computer science.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Computer Systems Development (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 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 2: Programming Skills (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 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
### SLO 3: Algorithm Design and Analysis (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 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

### SLO 4: Discrete Mathematics (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 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 5: Hardware Systems (G: 1) (M: 1, 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
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 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

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

#### Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - 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 2008-2009 - 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 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 2, 3, 4)**
Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on assignments and projects targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected...
questions on the assignments and projects in the corresponding courses. Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Programming Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Discrete Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Computer Systems Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Programming Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Discrete Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews

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.

**Source of Evidence:** Exit interviews with grads/program completers

### M 5: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 2, 3, 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

#### Target for O1: Computer Systems Development

The majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment reveals that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Programming Skills

The majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment reveals that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis

The majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment reveals that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O4: Discrete Mathematics

The majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment reveals that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O5: Hardware Systems

The majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment reveals that the majority of the students found the coursework useful and interesting and feel well prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Coordinate lower level classes**

Establish a coordinator for each of the lower level classes. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors of the course they are assigned to in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Programming Skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Coordinate lower level classes**

Establish a coordinator for each of the lower level classes. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors of the course they are assigned to in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department intends to establish a committee for collecting data reflecting pass/fail/withdrawal rates across the various sections of our lower-level classes. This will allow us to determine if there is consistency among the sections taught.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based upon feedback received from our Academic Program Review and the assessment cycle, the department has decided to have tenured/tenure-track faculty teach lower-level courses rather than solely relying upon Instructors and TAs.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Data from our Senior Oral and Written Presentations measure reflected that the writing skills of our seniors needed to be improved. With the implementation of CTW (critical thinking through writing) in our Data Structures and Software Engineering courses, the students will be exposed to better writing practices within the Computer Science curriculum.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Computer Science MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders 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.

Goals
G 1: Computer Science MS Goals
Students will become better solvers of advanced computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop advanced computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career applying advanced computer science methods.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration) (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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

Other Outcomes/Objectives
**O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

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**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Research and Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 4, 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

**O/O 3: Collaboration (G: 1) (M: 4)**

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 4, 6)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing and oral conventions and formats.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Research Publications (O: 2, 4)**

Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by M.S. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (ongoing).

Source of Evidence: External report

**Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

M.S. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Communication**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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%.

**M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 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)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.
Target for O5: 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

Findings 2008-2009 - 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 3: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 2, 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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

M 4: 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).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: 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

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

Target for O3: Collaboration

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

Target for O4: Communication

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.
Target for **O5: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

**M 5: Examinations (O: 1, 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)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for **O1: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

**M 6: 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).

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target for **O1: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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: Research and Critical Thinking**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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: 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 2008-2009 - 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: 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 suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

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

Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option
Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option
Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Written Assignments and Reports
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations

Dispatch alumni surveys
Prepare a survey questionnaire to send out to alumni from the Master's program.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Ms. Tammie Dudley
- Budget Amount Requested: $1,000.00 (recurring)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department intends to have the Graduate Director along with the Graduate Faculty explore the option of offering a course only Master's degree.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

None.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.


Based upon the findings for the foundations courses, the department intends to strictly enforce taking the prerequisite courses in discrete math.

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2008-2009 Computer Science PhD**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

**MISSION** Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas: - Research: To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution. - Educational Programs: To provide the next generation of leaders, educators and capable lifelong learners in computer science. - Service: To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines. The Department of Computer Science Ph.D. Program provides students with the underpinnings and advanced topics of computation and computer science for today's applications in industry, science, education, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

### Goals

**G 1: Computer Science PhD Goals**

Students will become better solvers of open computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop novel computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career as computer scientists.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Computer Science Foundations**

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

**SLO 2: Teaching**

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 3: Communication**

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 5: Collaboration**

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 6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

Students should be able to: (a) analyze, correlate and extract information from biological and chemical databases with emphasis on the sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic acids, (b) apply computational tools, techniques and models to analysis of protein
and nucleic acid sequences, and (c) develop new bioinformatics tools, techniques and models.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Research and Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)**
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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Student evaluations (O: 2)**
Student evaluations will be assessed to monitor the quality of teaching by our Ph.D. students
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
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.

**M 2: Qualifying exam (O: 1, 6)**
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.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

**Target for O6: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery.

**M 3: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 3, 4, 6)**
Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (on going).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
A total of 7 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: Communication**
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
A total of 7 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

**Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
A total of 7 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: 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 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
A total of 7 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

**M 4: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O3: Communication**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O4: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O5: Collaboration**
The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O6: 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.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

### M 5: Research Publications (O: 1, 3, 4, 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).

Source of Evidence: External report

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O3: Communication**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Research and Critical Thinking**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

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

#### 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. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Qualifying exam
  - Outcome/Objective: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations

#### Dispatch Alumni Survey

Prepare a survey questionairre to send out to alumni from the PhD program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alumni Surveys
  - Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $1,000.00 (recurring)

#### Review qualifying exam format

Review the format of the PhD qualifying examination to consider an option of replacing one mandatory foundation subject exam with a subject exam chosen by the student based upon their focus of research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department intends to have the Graduate Committee explore options of changing the format for the PhD Qualifying examination. The possible option is to reduce the number of mandatory foundation exams and allow the students to select a subject area based upon their area of research.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department changed the number of times the PhD Qualifying Exam was offered to students. Prior years it was offered three times a year, (September, December, May), now it is being offered twice a year (October and May).

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based upon placement of our students, we should consider implementing a strict policy for quality and quantity of publications.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

**On-Going Improvement**

The assessment data show that both the programs are currently meeting or exceeding expectations, and have shown improvement over the data in 2008. With this in mind, the key elements of the action plan are as follows:

1. To continue the efforts made over the past few years in keeping the course material current, updating cases and examples to reflect industry practices today.
2. To add more resources online to aid in software competency.
3. To encourage students to engage in collaborative learning. Students post projects on the web and learn from each other's work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BA Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The key strategy is to remain proactive and ensure that the content in each course remains current, with updated examples and cases.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The main area of weakness last year was students’ ability to gain sufficient competence with SAS software. Additional resources were made available online and extra time spent in the classroom to address that issue in the Data Mining course.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment this year meets or exceeds the criteria we set in all the areas. Evidence shows students performing well in all the major areas of Business Modeling, Data Mining and other Analyses. The faculty in this area has been proactive in creating course
offerings that are currently in demand in industry. Anecdotal evidence from graduates suggests that the MS and MBA programs in this area have been successful.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

There have not been any major operational changes in the Business Analysis unit. The faculty members believe that the current structure is effective in continuing both assessment and ongoing improvement actions.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The information that was collected in Business Analysis with respect to both the MS and MBA concentration was useful in supporting the decision to continue the current approach to assessment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

In both the MS and the MBA program improvement initiatives will continue along the same lines as in 2008-09, with the content changed as set out in the two Action Plans for Business Analysis.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Students will be able to integrate the functional knowledge and skills gained in the core subjects that include finance, accounting, marketing, etc. along with entrepreneurship to understand and work effectively within the dynamics and challenges of the new venture arena and the management of entrepreneurial ventures. Upon successfully completing the concentration, students will 1) create business ideas, 2) evaluate whether an idea is a good business opportunity, 3) understand how to gather resources to move a business opportunity to the marketplace, 4) be made aware of various options to exit the business 5) prepare verbal presentations and 6) be prepared to participate with a team in an entrepreneurial context.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Create Business Ideas**

Students will be able to use sound knowledge of business and economics in order to develop new business ideas that could be viable new ventures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Evaluation Skills**

Students will be able to evaluate business opportunities and accurately judge the situations likelihood of being developed into a viable business. Students will be able to support their conclusions as to the opportunities viability by applying material from the Entrepreneurship courses and other functional core classes of the MBA program.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Resource Acquisition Skills

Students understand how to gather resources to move a business opportunity to the marketplace.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Business Exit Plans

Students have to show the ability to develop both the content and implementation aspects of a business exit strategy for a business. Students need to understand when a business is failing, when failing business can or cannot be saved and why, and what actions should be taken to maximize the investors recovery of capital in each context.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Verbal Business Plan Presentation Skills

Students will be able to prepare and present an oral business plan in a logical and precise fashion consistent with what is common practice in practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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

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

**Development of Measures**

The Entrepreneurship faculty will develop measures for the Learning Outcomes that were developed in the last Academic Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>11/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation of Assessment Process**

The Entrepreneurship assessment team will implement the assessment of the measures developed and assess the initial results of an MBA Concentration assessment in Entrepreneurship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The implementation of the action plan will be done with sequential development of, application of, and assessment of results from measures of the learning outcomes.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the
coming academic year?
No changes have been made. The Entrepreneurship faculty developed the Learning Outcomes for the concentration in the 08-09 AY and will run the first assessment in the current AY.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The development of the assessment program for the Entrepreneurship Concentration in the MBA program was in progress during the 08-09 AY. It will be implemented for the first time in the 09-10 AY.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The Entrepreneurship faculty has begun to work with the Department's Associate Chair more closely in order to fully develop an effective assessment program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

There were no findings in AY 08-09 to report.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The improvement will be the first systematic assessment of the Entrepreneurship concentration. This will be of great help in continually improving of the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST (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.

This Mission was established in 2006-07. It was not moved forward when the WEAVE version was updated.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: The Role of HR in Organizations (M: 1, 2)**

The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to understand and effectively apply the appropriate job analysis, job description, job evaluation, performance appraisal, dispute resolution, and HR policy formulation techniques in a variety of settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 2: Problem Solving (M: 3, 4)**

The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify, evaluate, and effectively react to issues in the areas of employee relations and performance management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 3: Links with Business Strategy (M: 5)**

The MBA-HRM student will be able to define, select, and defend specific business strategies and the appropriate HR policies for each of those strategies.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: General Understanding of HR in Organizations (O: 1)**

Students will understand the role and usage of job analysis, job description, job evaluation, and performance appraisal techniques and can apply the appropriate method in a variety of settings.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: The Role of HR in Organizations**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected exam questions in MGS 8300, 8360, and 8390.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0.

**M 2: HR Formulation Techniques (O: 1)**

The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify, evaluate, and effectively react to issues in the areas of employee relations and performance management.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: The Role of HR in Organizations**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected exam questions in MGS 8300, 8360, and 8390. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately and in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0

**M 3: Identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues. (O: 2)**

Students can identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Problem Solving**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 rubric to randomly selected projects from MGS 8300, MGS 8395. Learning Outcome 2 Effectively engage in HR problem solving Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 3: Students can identify, and evaluate critical issues in HR problems. Student can only identify and evaluate only a few issues in HR problems. Student can identify and evaluate most critical issues in HR problems. Student can identify and evaluate all critical issues in HR problems.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Outcomes and Analysis: Faculty rating of 1.5/3.0. 50% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 4: Resource Identification in HR (O: 2)**

Students can find and apply appropriate resources to address critical HR issues and solve HR problems.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Problem Solving**

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 4 Rubric to randomly selected project reports in MGS 8300 and MGS 8395. Learning Outcome 2 Effectively engage in HR problem solving Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 4: Students can find resources to solve HR problems. Student can find only a few or can only find inappropriate resources. Student can find only a minimum number of appropriate resources. Student can find many appropriate resources.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 68% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

M 5: Links with Business Strategy (O: 3)
Students will show the ability to select appropriate business strategies and accompanying HR strategies and policies in case analyses in MGS 8300, MGS 8390, and MGS 8395.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Links with Business Strategy
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 3: Understand and effectively communicate how HR strategies support employer business strategies. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 5. Selection of appropriate business strategies and accompanying HR policies. Incomplete or inappropriate selection of business and HR strategies with weak defense. Adequate and appropriate selection of business and HR strategies with adequate defense. Adequate and appropriate selection of business and HR strategies with strong defense.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.73/3.0.

M 6: Law and Issue Identification (O: 4)
This measure will capture the students' ability to identify and address legal issues and relevant laws and policies to address legal issues in compensation, selection, and other HR areas.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: HR Law
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 6 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 4: Understand the role of legal constraints on HR activities and policies. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 6: Identify and address legal issues and relevant laws and policies to address legal issues in compensation, selection, and other HR areas. Can identify a few legal issues and relevant laws and some policies to address. Can identify most legal issues and relevant laws and most policies to address. Can identify all legal issues and relevant laws and all policies to address.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.68/3.0.

M 7: Understanding and Interpreting case Law (O: 4)
This measure will capture the students' ability to understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: HR Law
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 7 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 4: Understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues. Can discuss some implications of HR case law and can apply to some HR legal issues. Can discuss most implications of HR case law and can apply to most HR legal issues. Can discuss all implications of HR case law and can apply to all HR legal issues.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.54/3.0.

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

HR Concepts
With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's understanding of fundamental HR concepts, two actions will be taken: · Add an in-class activity in each class teaching fundamental differences among job descriptions, analysis, and performance measures. Reevaluate after next offering. · Add a homework assignment in each class to link strategies and HR policies. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

HR Law
With respect to the fourth learning outcome, the student's ability to understand the role of legal constraints on HR activities and policies, two actions will be taken: · Increase lecture time on relevant laws by 1 hour in each class (MGS 8320, MGS 8360, MGS 8390). Reevaluate after next offering. · Add a reading assignment in MGS 8320 to cover the linkages between HR law and policies. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
**HR Problem Solving**

With respect to the second learning outcome, the student’s ability to effectively engage in HR problem solving, two actions will be taken: · Add a short reading about problem statement to the MGS 8300 class. Reevaluate after next offering. · Add a short lecture with in-class activity on academic and practical research to the MGS 8300 class; invite specialists to speak to classes. Reevaluate after next offering.

**Performance Management**

With respect to the fourth learning outcome, the student’s ability to understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques, two actions will be taken: · Add a 30-minute lecture in MGS 8300 and provide additional supplemental handouts on performance management. Evaluate after next offering. · Add a homework assignment in MGS 8300 on linking performance management to specific employer productivity measures. Require students to find research results for performance management techniques. Evaluate after next offering.

**Recruitment and Selection**

With respect to the second learning outcome, the student’s ability to effectively engage in HR problem solving, two actions will be taken: · Add a short reading about problem statement to the MGS 8300 class. Reevaluate after next offering. · Add a short lecture with in-class activity on academic and practical research to the MGS 8300 class; invite specialists to speak to classes. Reevaluate after next offering.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Faculty will review each others’ syllabi and assignments to check for clarity and rigor.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We are placing more emphasis on defining specific behaviors we expect from our students. We have refined, adapted, and expanded our rubric measures.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We will be adding more illustrations and examples for our students to follow and spending more class time emphasizing concepts and research rather than facts.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We have developed a more systematic and comprehensive method for identifying our majors and assessing their work. We have begun to institutionalize the assessment of our students using our new rubric measures.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Our findings indicate that students coming to our programs may not be as prepared as we had thought in terms of research, writing, and detailed conceptual work. This is useful information, as we have had to adapt our class times to working with our students more closely and doing more remedial work in class.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will use more frequent “mini-assessments” in our classes to see if the new emphases in our classroom delivery are paying off. We expect a slow but steady improvement next year. We would like to see a 3-4 percentage point increase in the proportion of our students meeting expectations on all measures.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Concentration in Operations Management MBA

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

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

A strategic view of OM
With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken: · Add several readings from Business Week or Wall Street Journal about aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise based on a case about operations making significant difference for a company' long term shareholder value. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

An Environment/Substantiality Viewpoint
With respect to the third learning outcome, develop an environment/substantiality viewpoint, two actions will be taken: · Add a class project that connects OM theory and applications. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise to let students discuss the impact of OM and supply chain decisions on the environment and industrial substantiality. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Decision Making Abilities
With respect to the second learning outcome, to develop decision-making abilities, two actions will be taken: · Require students to add more analysis in students' group project and include numbers in their report. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise to let students discuss various measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the current globalizing business environment. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Team Membership
With respect to the fourth learning outcome, to become a strong team member, three actions will be taken: · Incorporate lessons on effective teams into teaching material. · Require team members in the group project to create a team charter indicating an emphasis on the importance of cooperation and fairly distributed individual contributions. Evaluate after next offering. · Ask each team to evaluate other teams’ performance to emphasize the importance of team work. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Faculty will review each others’ syllabi and assignments to check for clarity and rigor. Faculty will convene regularly to discuss any new findings during the semester.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
An elective has been required for all MBA students to select. We have placed more emphasis on the overall application of operations in the firm and its supply chain. We have refined, adapted, and expanded our rubric measures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We will be adding more illustrations and examples for our students to follow and spending more class time emphasizing concepts and research rather than facts. We will emphasize the importance of using companies where students are employed for their projects so that students’ career can benefit from the project. We will focus more on supply chain management, team skills and integrative skills.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
We have moved to learning objectives that measure individual performance rather than team performance. We have continued and increased the focus on the relationship between OM and the other functions within the organization, which includes highlighting OM and its overall performance. Further, we have placed more emphasis on the analysis of smaller details within the projects as well as on the overall picture of the process. These changes have been providing positive feedback with the achievement of rubric measures.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Our findings indicate that students coming to our programs may not be as prepared as we had thought in terms of research, writing, and detailed conceptual work. Some students have engineering degree with a strong analytical background while some students do not have such strong skill. This is useful information, as we have had to adapt our class times to working with our students more closely and doing more remedial work in class.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will use more frequent “mini-assessments” in our classes to see if the new emphases in our classroom delivery are paying off. We expect a slow but steady improvement next year. We would like to see a 3-4 percentage point increase in the proportion of our students meeting expectations on all measures.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Concentration in Organization Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Managerial Skill Set (M: 1)
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

**SLO 2: Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Mgt. (M: 1)**

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: Development of MBA Assessment (M: 2)**

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: Faculty Assessment of Proficiency (O: 1, 2)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Managerial Skill Set**

Having 80% of the students at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each course is desired.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

In the last full assessment of the twelve student skills assessed in twelve different courses 9 were found to have met the criteria. Two clearly did not, Negotiation and Business Plan. A third item. Individual Analysis was right at 80%. Assessment was not done of MBA Concentration students in the 2008-2009 cycle so that the faculty in the group could concentrate on a complete revision of the MS in Organization Change.

**Target for O2: Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Mgt.**

Having 80% of the students at "proficient" or "exemplary" in each course is desired.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

In the last full assessment of the twelve student skills assessed in twelve different courses 9 were found to have met the criteria. Two clearly did not, Negotiation and Business Plan. A third item. Individual Analysis was right at 80%. Assessment was not done of MBA Concentration students in the 2008-2009 cycle so that the faculty in the group could concentrate on a complete revision of the MS in Organization Change.

**M 2: Student Assessment of Performance (O: 3)**

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

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O3: Development of MBA Assessment**

We are expecting strong performance on the evaluations of overall strength of student skills. Strength goal = Average score of 70% endorsement of YES answers to the above questions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

In the last full assessment these results were obtained: I have enhanced my research skills Yes 30%; I have enhanced my case analysis skills Yes 50%; I have enhanced my critical thinking skills Yes 70%; I have enhanced my writing skills Yes 60%; I have enhanced my problem solving skills Yes 80%; I have enhanced my analysis skills Yes 80%; I have enhanced my oral presentation skills Yes 40%; I have enhanced my technology skills Yes (20%). Assessment was not done of MBA Concentration students in the 2008-2009 cycle so that the faculty in the group could concentrate on a complete revision of the MS in Organization Change.

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

**Ability to Demonstrate Critical Thinking**

With regard to learning outcome three, the ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills related to managing organizations, the following actions will be taken: Students will be asked about specific courses where critical thinking was required. Faculty will be asked about specific courses where they require critical thinking. These data will be analyzed and mapped with recommendations.
For future action.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Oral Communications
With regard to learning outcome four, the ability to orally present material related to managing organizations, the following actions will be taken:
- Students will be asked about specific courses where oral presentations were required.
- Faculty will be asked about specific courses where they require oral presentations.
- These data will be analyzed and mapped with recommendations for future action.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Organization Management Basics
With respect to learning outcome one, Enhancing Student Skills in Organization Management Basics, the following action items will be taken:
A survey will be conducted of the current MBA OM students that will address the rationale for this concentration, what they hope to achieve, and courses taken. Data from this survey will be analyzed and shared with relevant administrators with an eye towards having at least one required course in the OM concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Work in Teams
With respect to learning outcome two, 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, the following action items will be taken:
A survey will be conducted of the current MBA OM students that will address the prevalence of team assignments, case analyses, and oral presentations. Data from this survey will be analyzed and shared with relevant administrators with an eye towards increasing these types of activities in OM classes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: OB Faculty Membeers
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are taking a close look at this concentration and asking important questions: Who are the students seeking this concentration? What are the goals for seeking this concentration? Are their needs being met?

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year this area was dormant. No changes were made.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Last year this area was dormant. No changes were made.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Last year this area was dormant. No changes were made.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Last year this area was dormant. No changes were made.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We want to better define the outcomes of this concentration and ensure that we are meeting student needs. We anticipate a better sense of clarity by 100%.
Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
This concentration has been included in Weave Online in error. No separate plan is scheduled.

Goals
G 1: See Mission/Purpose

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: See Mission/Purpose (M: 1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: See Mission/Purpose (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O1: See Mission/Purpose
See Mission/Purpose

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
See Mission/Purpose

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Counseling Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Counseling Psychology PhD Program, a unit of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, subscribes to a scientist-practitioner model designed to integrate science with practice and advocacy. Students are prepared to generate and apply psychological knowledge to human development, adaptation, and adjustment issues.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients (M: 1, 2)
Prepared to work with clients who are culturally and individually different.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain D

O/O 2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice (M: 3, 4, 5)
Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

O/O 3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession (M: 6, 7)
Proficiency in psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

O/O 4: Understands relevant theories (M: 8, 9)
Understand theories of human development, psychopathology, counseling process, and behavior change.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B
**O/O 5: Use and conduct research (M: 10)**

Use and conduct research

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 1)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**

100% of students receive a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories related to counseling in multicultural settings.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on categories related to multicultural competency on both their midterm and end-of-semester written evaluations and oral feedback.

**M 2: Performance in Advanced Multicultural Course (O: 1)**

Performance in Advanced Multicultural Counseling Course (i.e., CPS 8340)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: 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 Counseling course

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.

**M 3: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 2)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

100% of students receive a satisfactory or higher ratings from their supervisors on categories related to professional ethics.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings from their supervisors on professional ethics during their mid-term and end-of-semester written evaluations and oral feedback.

**M 4: Performance in ethics course (O: 2)**

Performance in Ethics course (i.e., CPS 8530)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received satisfactory or higher ratings from instructors in all course assignments and course grades.

**M 5: Comprehensive examination question on ethics (O: 2)**

Ethics comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students 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 determine whether the student receives a grade of pass or fail.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice**

100% passing grades on Ethics comprehensive examination question

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

80% (4 of 5) of students received a passing mark on the ethics question in comprehensive examinations.

**M 6: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 3)**

Performance in didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
Ratings by instructors of satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grades in didactic courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 3)**
Written practicum evaluation from supervisors. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must receive a score of 3 or higher on all items to be satisfactory.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
100% of students received a satisfactory rating, or higher, from their supervisors on areas related to psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received satisfactory ratings, or higher, from their supervisors on areas related to psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Performance in theories courses (O: 4)**
Performance in theories courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Understands relevant theories**
Ratings by instructor of satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course assignments, and course grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all course assignments and course grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)**
Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to the question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a three-person faculty committee who determine whether the students receives a grade of pass or fail.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O4: Understands relevant theories**
100% passing grades on theory comprehensive examination question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% (4 of 5) students passed the theory question in the comprehensive examination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Performance in research courses (O: 5)**
Performance in courses about research methods (e.g., EPRS 8530, EPRS 8540, EPRS 9820, CPS 9920)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**
Ratings from instructor at satisfactory or above levels in all course assignments, as well as course grades in research courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students obtained satisfactory or higher ratings by instructors in all research courses, research design assignments, and research projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comprehensive Examination Orientation**
Present an orientation the the comprehensive examination to enhance students' preparation for the theories portion of the comprehensive examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Comprehensive examination question on theory | Outcome/Objective: Understands relevant theories

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

**Comprehensive Examination Orientation**
To offer an orientation to the comprehensive examination process so that students can focus their preparation for the examination more effectively.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Program director will coordinate with other counseling psychology faculty to schedule comprehensive examination orientation to help prepare students for the comprehensive examination.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Provided additional support for off-campus practicum experiences. Changed the credit hours for practicum and internship to better reflect workload. Developed a seminar on the history and systems of psychology.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Students generally continue to meet and exceed all outcome assessment goals for learning.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
No operational improvements were logical actions from last year’s report.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Students generally continue to meet and exceed outcome assessment goals for learning.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Plan to review the objectives as a faculty make sure that our assessment is both appropriate and comprehensive.
G 4: Supervision
Students will gain knowledge and develop skills in the area of counseling supervision.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Teaching (M: 1, 2, 3)
1. Students will demonstrate the ability to develop course syllabi. 2. Students will demonstrate the ability to prepare for class. 3. Students will demonstrate the ability to meet the goals and objectives of their course.

O/O 2: Research (M: 4, 5)
1. Students will demonstrate the ability to critique a research manuscript. 2. Students will demonstrate the ability to design and implement a research project.

O/O 3: Clinical Skills (M: 6)
1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of counseling theory and concepts. 2. Students will demonstrate professional and ethical behavior in clinical practice. 3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds. 4. Students will understand the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients.

O/O 4: Supervision (M: 7)
1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of supervision and counseling theories and concepts. 2. Students will demonstrate professional and ethical behavior in the practice of clinical supervision. 3. Students will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Teaching (O: 1)
Students will receive a passing on the teaching section of their professional portfolio which is one of the assignments in their CPS 9963 course. In order to pass the teaching section of the portfolio, the students must submit a copy of a sample course syllabi that they developed for a course they have taught or are currently teaching. The syllabi will be assessed based on the following criteria: 1) does the syllabi clearly state the purpose of the course; 2) does the syllabi contact the mission of the CPS program; 3) does the syllabi contact criteria for evaluation; and 4) does the syllabi contact a tentative outline of the course.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Teaching
Target is passing the portfolio.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Eight students were enrolled in CPS 9963. All eight students received a Pass on their professional portfolios- a required assignment in the class.

M 2: Teaching (O: 1)
On question 5 (the instructor was well prepared) of the teaching evaluation form, students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1 is low and 5 is the highest) with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O1: Teaching
Target is a score of 3 on question 5 of the teaching evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean for question 5 was 4.62 (5 point scale), the range was 4.2 to 4.84.

M 3: Teaching (O: 1)
On question 8 (goals and objectives of the course were met) of the teaching evaluation form, students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1 is low and 5 is the highest) with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O1: Teaching
Target is a mean of 3 on question 8 of the teaching evaluations, with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The mean for question 8 on the teaching evaluations for our students was 4.71 with the range 4.5-4.9.

M 4: Research (O: 2)
Students will complete and submit their predissertation project.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Research
Students will complete their predissertation study.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students who have submitted their predissertation study received a pass for their predissertation.

**M 5: Research (O: 2)**

Students will receive a Passing on the research portion of their comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: Research**

All students who take the comprehensive examination will receive a pass on the research question.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students who completed their comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year, successfully passed the research portion of the examination.

**M 6: Clinical Skills (O: 3)**

Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession. 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients. 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Clinical Skills**

Target--students will receive at least a 3 on the relevant questions of their supervisee evaluations with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

1. On the question: "demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts", students had a mean of 5, with a 100% receiving a 5. 2. On the question: "demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession", students had a mean of 4.86, with 100% receiving a 4 or 5. 3. On the question: "demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds", students had a mean of 4.86, with 100% receiving a 4 or 5. 4. On the question: "understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients", students received a mean of 4.86, with 100% receiving a 4 or 5.

**M 7: Supervision (O: 4)**

Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of supervision and counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds. 3. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling/supervision profession and utilizes supervision to clarify ethical challenges faced with supervisees.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O4: Supervision**

Target-students will receive at least a 3 on the SIT evaluation forms, with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

On the question: "demonstrates knowledge of supervision and counseling theory and concepts", the mean was 5, with 100% receiving a 5. On the question: "demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds", the mean was 5, with 100% receiving a 5. On the question: "demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling/supervision profession and utilizes supervision to clarify ethical challenges faced with supervisees", the mean was 5, with 100% receiving a 5.

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

**Teaching-Portfolios**

Continue to monitor the portfolios in CPS 9963.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are looking into using LIVETXT as a means for collecting and maintaining student outcomes. This year we will pilot LIVETXT with the 2009 incoming class.
**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have established quantitative measures for assessing teaching, supervision, and clinical skills.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings suggest that our program is meeting our program goals.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

n/a

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings suggest that the program is meeting the program goals.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will continue to monitor student progress and meet regularly as a program to assess student outcome.

---

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The mission of the Department is to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice leadership positions in public and private agencies. This report provides an assessment of student learning for the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Goals**

G 1: Students will demonstrate critical thinking

Students will undertake a variety of contemporary criminal justice readings, discussions, and activities designed to develop, enhance, and demonstrate critical thinking skills.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students are exposed to a wide range of contemporary crime and justice issues. Students will effectively analyze these issues using a social science perspective.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students are exposed to a wide range of multicultural issues including race, class, age, and gender. Students will effectively analyze contemporary multicultural issues and their relationship to crime and justice in America.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plan Associations
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will effectively analyze contemporary global and international crime and criminal justice issues, including comparing crime rates in a number of countries (Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Japan, and America).

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plan Associations
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Embedded examination questions (O: 1, 2, 3)
Multiple sections (2-4) of CRJU 2200 are offered during both the Fall and Spring semesters and each course uses three objective examinations throughout the term. These examinations cover approximately one-third (1/3) of the course. Two objective questions per objective are embedded on one of the three exams in each section taught. All students in all sections are required to answer each assessment question on one of the three examinations. Although each instructor asks different questions, the questions posed relate directly to the material covered in the class and to a specific goal.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues
Three sections of CRJU 2200 were offered during the 2008-2009 Academic year. Data was collected on the two sections taught by Dr. Tim Brezina and Dr. Wendy Guastafero. (The third section was taught by a part-time instructor whose mid-term resignation precluded the inclusion of data relative to her class). Both instructors included two questions assessing students’ knowledge of contemporary crime/criminal justice issues. The target achievement goal was that there would be an 80% pass rate for each question. The questions used are set forth below. Brezina’s Sections Q1. 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. Q2. 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. Guastaferro’s Sections Q1. If a person with mental illness is violent, the most common victim is: A. Animal, such as a pet B. Family member or caregiver* C. Young women D. Police officer Q2. One-third of people are homeless are: A. People recently released from prison. B. Families.* C. Mentally ill. D. A & C. E. None of the above.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
There was a combined total of 126 students (N=68 for Guastafero and N=58 for Brezina) in the two CRJU 2200 courses assessed during this period. Provided below are the percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions in each class: Dr. Guastafero’s sections Q1 Pass Rate was 92%; Q2 Pass Rate was 87%. Dr. Brezina’s sections Q1 Pass Rate was 65%; Q2 Pass Rate was 86%.

Target for O2: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues
Each instructor included two questions assessing students’ knowledge of contemporary multicultural issues on an exam in each section taught. The target achievement goal was an 80% pass rate for each question. The questions by instructor are provided in the attached document entitled Assessment Measures by Instructor by Semester_2010_2011.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Student responses (N=68 for Guastafero and N=58 for Brezina) to each question were tabulated and analyzed. The percentage pass rate for each question was calculated and is presented below: Dr. Guastafero’s sections: Q3 Pass Rate was 91%; Q4 Pass Rate was 72%. Dr. Brezina’s sections: Q3 Pass Rate was 94%; Q4 Pass Rate was 82%.

Target for O3: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues
Each instructor included two questions assessing students' knowledge of contemporary global and international issues on an exam in each section taught. The target achievement goal was an 80% pass rate for each question. The questions by instructor are provided in the attached document entitled Assessment Measures by Instructor by Semester_2010_2011.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Student responses (N=68 for Guastaferro and N=58 for Brezina) to each question were tabulated and analyzed. The percentage pass rate for each question was calculated and is presented below: Dr. Guastaferro's sections: Q5 Pass Rate was 83; Q6 Pass Rate was 93%. Dr. Brezina's sections: Q5 Pass Rate was 69%; Q6 Pass Rate was 92%.

**Review of course content and assessment measures**

See plan for contemporary criminal justice issues.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2010  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Review of course content and assessment measures**

See plan for contemporary criminal justice issues.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Review of course content and assessment measures**

Consistent with last year's action plan, the Undergraduate Committee (UC) will meet with teaching faculty at the beginning of Fall semester 2009 to discuss course content and evaluate the effectiveness of current assessment measures used in CrJu 2200. The UC will assist faculty to implement such changes as they deem necessary.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Criminal Justice Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?  
The Undergraduate Committee will continue to solicit feedback from the faculty assigned to teach CrJu 2200 regarding the currency of course content and the appropriateness of student learning outcomes and measures.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In last year's action plan the Department stated that teaching faculty would meet prior to the semester to identify several questions that could be used for comparative assessment across courses. As a follow-up measure, the Department determined to allow teaching faculty to use non-identical questions since—although the focus of the learning goals and objectives are the same—the texts, materials, and activities used in each class differs. Thus, instructors are permitted to develop questions that assess the student learning outcomes but are appropriate to the unique learning environment of each class.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from
For the past two years the Department has been engaged in a curriculum overhaul involving the review of every course in the undergraduate curriculum. As a part of this review we have reevaluated the learning goals and objectives, course content, and assessment measures used in CrJu 2200. As a result, we have determined that the course content and learning objectives are appropriate, and the instructional methodologies are effective to ensure that student learning occurs at an appropriate level. While we will continue to review this course on an annual basis, currently we do not anticipate making any programmatic or curriculum changes based on this year’s assessment results.

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

**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 mission of the Department is to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice leadership positions in public and private agencies. This report provides an assessment of student learning for the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Goals**

**G 3: Apply social science approach to study of crime**

Students will apply the social science approach to the study of crime and justice in society taking into consideration the academic contributions of other disciplines (e.g., anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, public administration, and sociology), and assessing the role of law in the administration of justice.

**G 1: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system**

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).

**G 2: Develop critical thinkers**

Students will be able to think critically about crime and justice issues.

**G 4: Preparation for leadership positions**

Students will develop the knowledge and skills necessary for assuming criminal justice leadership positions in the public and private sector.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate ability to write effectively (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and effectively in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking
3. 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 2: Demonstrate critical thinking skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically using scientific reasoning and will provide evidence of this skill through written and oral communications.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Critical Thinking
4. 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: Demonstrate critical reading skills (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to read critically.

**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 4: Demonstrate use of technology**

Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively use various forms of technology including computers, word processing software, internet resources, and email.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 7 Technology

**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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 5: Communicate Effectively (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively about criminal justice issues and processes using the spoken word.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written Assignment (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The Department uses CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice as one of two capstone courses. CrJu 4930 also serves as the Department's designated CTW course. The CTW assignment is designed to test student's ability to critically evaluate an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, which is described in detail in the 2009 CTW Report, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, select a specific theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that has impacted understanding of the issue, and prepare a position paper that addresses policy implications and recommendations.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Demonstrate ability to write effectively**

At least 80% of students enrolled in CrJu 4930 will demonstrate the ability to write effectively as evidenced by their achievement of a score of 3 or higher on the analysis of criminological/criminal justice (CTW) essay. The students were assessed using a 5-item holistic rubric designed to assess critical thinking, critical reading, and writing skills (Superior 5; Above Average 4; Average 3; Below Average 2; Unacceptable 1).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The Department has limited data on the achievement of this measure. Data was available on 8 students that were enrolled in the summer section of CrJu 4930 Seminar in Criminal Justice. The students scored an average of 4.1 on items assessing their ability to write effectively.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**

At least 80% of students enrolled in CrJu 4930 will demonstrate the ability to think critically as evidenced by their achievement of a score of 3 or higher on the analysis of criminological/criminal justice (CTW) essay. The students were assessed using a 5-item holistic rubric designed to assess critical thinking, critical reading, and writing skills (Superior 5; Above Average 4; Average 3; Below Average 2; Unacceptable 1).
The Department has limited data on this achievement of this measure. Data was available on 8 students that were enrolled in the summer section of CrJu 4930. The students scored an average of 3.9 on items evaluating their ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate critical reading skills**

At least 80% of students enrolled in CrJu 4930 will demonstrate the ability to read critically as evidenced by their achievement of a score of 3 or higher on the analysis of criminological/criminal justice (CTW) essay. The students were assessed using a 5-item holistic rubric designed to assess critical thinking, critical reading, and writing skills (Superior 5; Above Average 4; Average 3; Below Average 2; Unacceptable 1).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The Department has limited data on this achievement of this measure. Data was available on 8 students that were enrolled in the summer section of CrJu 4930. The students scored an average of 3.9 on items assessing their ability to read critically.

**M 2: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

The Alumni Survey is designed to capture graduates' perceptions of the criminal justice program and their level of education and job preparedness gained as a result of being a student in this program. The Department surveyed a total of 232 alumni. Using a scale of 1 to 4 (1=not satisfied; 4 very satisfied) alumni are asked to rate their satisfaction with their educational preparation (communication skills, critical thinking skills, knowledge and understanding of the crime and the justice system, etc).

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Demonstrate ability to write effectively**

At least 80% of the 232 alumni surveyed about their satisfaction with the level of academic preparation they received, which enabled them to write effectively, will rate their satisfaction level at 3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

230 alumni responded to this question. On a 4-point scale (with 4 being the highest) the mean score was 4 indicating that alumni were very satisfied with the level of academic preparation they received with regard to their writing skills.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**

At least 80% of the 232 alumni surveyed about their satisfaction with the level of academic preparation they received, which enabled them to think critically and analytically, will rate their satisfaction level at 3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

232 alumni responded to this question. The mean score was 3.41, indicating that alumni are satisfied with the level of academic preparation they received.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate critical reading skills**

At least 80% of alumni surveyed about their satisfaction with the level of academic preparation they received, which enabled them to read critically, will rate their satisfaction level at 3 or higher.

**Target for O5: Communicate Effectively**

At least 80% of alumni surveyed about their satisfaction with the level of academic preparation they received, which enabled them to communicate effectively orally, will rate their satisfaction level at 3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

231 alumni responded to this question. The mean score was 4, indicating that alumni are very satisfied with the level of academic preparation they received with regard to their oral communication skills.

**M 3: Analysis of Curriculum (O: 2)**

In Spring 2008 the Criminal Justice Department held a faculty retreat for the purpose of curriculum assessment. In addition to reviewing each course for need and relevancy, faculty members sought to determine whether each course addressed critical thinking in a manner that is consistent with the discipline.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Target for O2: Demonstrate critical thinking skills**

100% of criminal justice courses in the major will be designed to include teaching and assessment of critical thinking skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Criminal Justice faculty recently completed an evaluative review of all criminal justice courses. Although this review revealed that all courses incorporate a focus on critical thinking within the discipline, discussion indicate that not all faculty are using objective (i.e., non-graded) assessment measures.

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

**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*
Improve data collection efforts
The Department will make a concerted effort to collect and analyze appropriate data for academic assessment purposes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Written Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate ability to write effectively

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

Improve data collection efforts
The Department will make a concerted effort to improve data collection efforts.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Written Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate critical reading skills

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

Objective assessment measures
The CTW Ambassador will meet with faculty to discuss the need to use objective assessment measures that are independent of grades.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Analysis of Curriculum | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate critical thinking skills

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Criminal Justice MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to generate and disseminate knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large.

Goals
G 1: Develop knowledge
Students will develop knowledge about crime and criminal justice systems and processes

G 0: Critical thinking
Students will be able to think critically about issues related to crime and criminal justice policies

G 2: Preparation for leadership positions
Students will be prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice issues.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data (G: 0) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to critically analyze crime and justice issues and/or information, utilizing theoretical, methodological, and statistical skill bases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Apply research and statistical skills (G: 0) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply acquired research and statistical skill bases to evaluate the quality of scholarly products and their contribution to the field of criminology and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Understand criminological theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understand theory of criminal justice responses (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base of criminal justice responses to crime and criminality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Understand how systems &amp; processes interact (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to provide an integrated view of crime and criminal justice systems and processes and how the components interact and intersect to provide coordinated justice administration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Apply theory and terminology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply learned terminology and theory to real-world situations that both relate to and expand outside the fields of criminology and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

#### 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Communicate effectively (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to effectively communicate, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Knowledge assessment survey of Non-thesis students (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An 18 item faculty-rated assessment survey is used to evaluate non-thesis students. The items are rated on a 5 point scale. The questionnaire is completed by the instructor of the capstone seminar shortly after the completion of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Critically analyze crime &amp; justice issues/data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met |
Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. All 5 students were evaluated on 3 of the five items that measure this objective. The average score across the three items with valid data was a 4.4, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. A comparison of this year’s findings with the two previous years shows consistent improvement on this learning outcome, with average scores in the two previous years being 4.08 (in 2006-2007) and 4.38 (in 2007-2008).

**Target for O3: Understand criminological theory**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. All 5 students were evaluated on the 1 item that measures this objective. The average score across the 5 students on this item was a 4.6, with 100% meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. A comparison of this year’s findings with previous years is not possible as in previous years this item was combined with the items assessing knowledge of criminal justice responses.

**Target for O4: Understand theory of criminal justice responses**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. At least 4 students were evaluated on 3 of the five items that measure this objective. Only two students were evaluated on one of the items and no information was available for any of the students on one of the five items. For reliability purposes the valid items for each student were averaged. The average score across all five students was a 4.8, with 100% of the students meeting the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. While previous years’ assessments contained one additional item (the item currently used to assess outcome 3), the majority of the items remain the same. A comparison of this year’s findings with the two previous years shows consistent improvement on this learning outcome, with average scores in the two previous years being 4.1 (in 2006-2007) and 4.5 (in 2007-2008). For comparison purposes, the average score on these items for this year when the item for outcome 3 is included, and hence using the same 6 items, is 4.75.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. All students were evaluated on the two items that measure this objective. The two items were averaged for each student and these averages ranged from 4.5-5.0 with the average across students being a 4.8. One hundred percent of the students met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. A comparison of this year’s findings with the two previous years shows improvement on this learning outcome, with average scores in both previous years being 4.5.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. All students were evaluated on the two items that measure this objective. The two items were averaged for each student and these averages ranged from 4.5-5.0 with the average across students being a 4.8. One hundred percent of the students met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. A comparison of this year’s findings with the two previous years shows improvement on this learning outcome, with average scores in the two previous years being 4.4 (for 2006-2007) and 4.63 (for 2007-2008).

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.0 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of non-thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Five non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2009. All students were evaluated on the three items that measure this objective. For reliability purposes the three items were averaged for each student and these averages ranged from 4.33-5.0 with the average across students being a 4.73. One hundred percent of the students met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher. A comparison of this year’s findings with the two previous years shows improvement on this learning outcome, with average scores in the two previous years being 4.43 (for 2006-2007) and 4.53 (for 2007-2008).

**M 2: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

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. Items are based on a 5 point scale.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items measuring this learning outcome.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on three of the five items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 4.67 across the three items.

**Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the three items measuring this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on each of the three items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 4.67 across the three items.

**Target for O3: Understand criminological theory**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the item measuring this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

One student completed a thesis during the Spring semester 2009. The student was not evaluated on the 1 item that measures this objective.

**Target for O4: Understand theory of criminal justice responses**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items measuring this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on three of the five items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 5.0 across the three items.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on both of the items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 5.0 across the two items.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on both of the items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 5.0 across the two items.

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items that measure this objective on the Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Only 1 student completed a Master's thesis during the 2008-2009 academic year. The student was assessed on each of the three items measuring this outcome. The student scored an average of 4.67 across the three items.

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

**Capstone Seminar Review**

- The capstone seminar was revised and approved by the Criminal justice faculty, CHHS Academic Affairs committee, and the college in the fall of 2007. Additional changes to the instruction plan and course requirements were then made and approved by the faculty. The course was taught by a new instructor in Fall 2009.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low

**Develop Embedded Measures in Core Courses**

- The current assessment of non-thesis students in the Masters program is based solely on indicators derived from the capstone course. Later this year, we will begin to work with faculty who teach core courses to develop measures that can be embedded in at least three of these courses and ways in which these measures can be retrieved, stored, and analyzed by the graduate coordinator.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
Develop Rubric for assessing non-thesis students

While our students continue to meet or exceed our target levels for learning outcomes, assessment of outcomes based on the revised capstone course suggested the need for a more reliable assessment tool than what is currently being used. The rubric will focus on the same learning outcomes as have already been established, but will provide more detail for assigning numerical scores. Once the rubric has been developed multiple members of the graduate committee can assess final papers in the capstone course in order to provide increased reliability.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: end of Spring semester 2010
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The graduate committee is working on developing a rubric to be used in assessing the final papers in our capstone course and these measures will be pilot tested this spring. Further members of the graduate committee will be meeting with faculty that teach courses in statistics, methods and theory to determine whether and what types of embedded questions can be used in these graduate courses.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our findings from this year's assessment demonstrate a continued improvement in learning outcomes. while this is a good thing, it also means that we are very close to reaching a ceiling from which we can no longer show improvement. Thus, our attention has, at least temporarily, turned to developing more specific and fine tuned measures. Once these measures have been developed and implemented we are hoping to get a better sense of specific areas that we can focus on for improvement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Dual Concentration in CIS/HA MBA
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The purpose of the MBA concentration in Health Informatics is to provide students with specialized skills to improve healthcare services enabled by information technology. Such improvements focus on the information-intensive nature of healthcare institutions and processes to increase the quality and reduce the cost of healthcare services.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources (M: 3)

Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and the practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the resources that comprise it. This includes the overall planning, organization, management, evaluation, quality, and major health-policy issues.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 1)

Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

O/O 2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems (M: 2)

After completing this course successfully, a student should have: · An in-depth knowledge of ubiquitous and pervasive information systems · A high-level understanding of UPIS applications and their usage scenarios · An understanding of multiple networking technologies to be used in UPIS environment · The skills to identify and design the infrastructure-support for ubiquitous and pervasive information systems · An in-depth knowledge of devices and middleware challenges in UPIS environment · A high-level knowledge of network and quality of service management · Skills to derive security and data-access requirements of different UPIS
Measures, Targets, and Findings

O/0: 4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems (M: 4)

Envision and describe considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and evaluation of health information systems in a variety of settings such as health systems, hospitals, and medical practices with a focus on the critical role of e-health and information systems in the planning, operation, and management of health care organizations.

M 1: Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions. (O: 1)

Students will understand and analyze security and privacy circumstances and will propose appropriate control decisions.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the exams in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls. Fails to Meet Standard = 1, Meets Standard = 2, Exceeds Standard = 3. Measure 1: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

No MBA HAIS students took CIS 8080 during 2008-2009. However, for a related concentration MBA IS, 75% of students achieved a score of 2 or higher. The score average was 2.125. We will consider this measure met for this assessment period.

M 2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems (O: 2)

Students will design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the semester paper in CIS 8070. Learning Objective: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Fails to Meet Standard = 1, Meets Standard = 2, Exceeds Standard = 3. Measure 1: Accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were not able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

No MBA HAIS students took CIS 8070 during 2008-2009. So, this objective and measure will be assumed to be met for this assessment period.

M 3: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources (O: 3)

Students will be able to articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the student work in HA 8160 Health Care System. Learning Objective: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Fails to Meet Standard = 1, Meets Standard = 2, Exceeds Standard = 3. Measure 1: Accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources. Students were able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

No MBA HAIS students took HA 8160 during 2008-2009. So, this objective and measure will be assumed to be met for this assessment period.

M 4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems (O: 4)

Students will identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target for O4: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the student work in HA 8670 Health Information Systems. Learning Objective: Identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.

Measure 1: Accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fails to Meet Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

No MBA HAIS students took HA 8670 during 2008-2009. So, this objective and measure will be assumed to be met for this assessment period.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is a relative new joint program between Computer Information Systems and Health Administration. The number of students with this concentration is just beginning to increase. No students in this MBA HAIS concentration took the four courses in the concentration during the 2008-2009 academic year. We anticipate that this will change for coming academic years and that those assessments will have more substantive findings. Until that time, we consider the objectives and measures to be met.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Please see the answer to Achievement Summary / Analysis Academic Question 1 for the response to this and remaining questions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Early Childhood Education BSED
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Education 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. In addressing the Board of Regents and legislative directives to increase the GA Workforce by 2020, the BSED Program continues to have a robust enrollment each year with 77 Traditional Program students (47 fall 2008, 30 spring 2009) and 33 Dual Certification Program students (2 fall 2008, 31 spring 2009) who graduated from the program in the fall '08 - spring '09 academic year.

Goals
G 1: Content Knowledge
The teacher candidate will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the curriculum he or she teaches.

G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills
The teacher candidate will have the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to plan and implement effective instruction.

G 3: Student Learning
The teacher candidate will use varied assessment techniques and critical reflection to increase student achievement.

G 4: Diversity
The teacher candidate will meet the cultural, linguistic, learning and behavioral needs of all learners.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 3)
Teacher candidates understand 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.
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

SLO 1: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 2) (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.

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

SLO 2: Effectively plans for instruction (G: 2) (M: 2)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

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

SLO 2: Plans effectively for instruction (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)
Teacher candidates plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

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

SLO 3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice (G: 4) (M: 1)
Teacher candidates use their knowledge of academic disciplines and their understanding of how children learn, develop, and differ in their approaches to learning to create, implement and evaluate instructional opportunities that are meaningful for all students. They use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. Teacher candidates use their understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation. They use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. They are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students,
parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally. Teacher candidates foster 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
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

**SLO 3: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Practices professional reflection (G: 3) (M: 4)**
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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Teacher candidates understand and use 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
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**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Fosters relationships with school and community (G: 4) (M: 5)**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Ratings: Communication and Technology (O: 1)

Faculty Ratings for assessment of learning outcome 6 are based on the following: Student Teaching observation scores: Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 5 Planning and Instruction; implementation of at least one lesson using technology; Final Student Teaching Evaluation: INTASC Standard 6 Communication Skills; Review of Professional Portfolio: Standard 6 Communication Skills

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Traditional Program students: 91.74% of candidates met objective 6: Uses communication skills and technology; Dual Certification Program students: 92.47% of candidates met objective 6: Uses communication skills and technology

M 1: Supported Reading Project (O: 2, 3)

Teacher candidates have multiple opportunities in their course and field experience work to plan and implement lessons. The Supported Reading Project is a comprehensive, instructional project in which teacher candidates develop supported reading lessons that they implement with elementary aged students. Candidates plan reading lessons to address the instructional needs of their students. Candidates reflect upon their teaching of each reading lesson, create new lessons that address both the strengths and weaknesses of the initial lesson, and use self-evaluation and feedback to improve future lessons. Candidates write reflections that discuss their evaluations of each lesson. This is a mid-program key assessment in ECE 3601: Reading and Language Arts in Early Childhood Education that assesses teaching diverse groups of learners, planning effectively for instruction, understanding and using assessment data; promoting student learning, and practicing professional reflection. The rubric used to assess the Supported Reading Project highlights competencies aligned with the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. A 50 point rubric is used to rate/score the candidate’s project on three components: planning, instructing, and reflecting. Ratings include: 4 ("proficiently met"), 3 ("adequately met"), 2 ("partially met"), and 1 ("minimally met"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive a rating of at least 3 ("adequately met") on a 4 point scale rubric to demonstrate competency in planning effectively for instruction (outcome 2). If the teacher candidate does not receive this rating, the teacher candidate has an opportunity to review the instructor’s feedback and revise and resubmit lessons for further evaluation. The project score is factored into the course grade. Teacher candidates must receive a passing grade of "C" or better in the course, or they will be required to repeat the course before moving forward in the program.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Traditional Program students: 90.41% of candidates met objective 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners; Dual Certification Program students: 91.4 % of candidates met objective 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners

M 2: Faculty Ratings: Planning for Instruction (O: 2)

Faculty Ratings for assessment of learning outcome 7 are based on the following: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module; Student Teaching observation scores: Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 5 Planning and Instruction Final Student Teaching Evaluation: INTASC Standard 7 Instructional Planning; Review of Professional Portfolio: Standard 7 Instructional Planning

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
M 2: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM) (O: 2)

Teacher candidates continuously have opportunities to impact student achievement. Through intentionally designed assignments they are required to document their use of an array of assessment tools including KWLS charts, pre and post tests, learning gains graphs, and grade books. The Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM), in the student teaching course ECE 4661, is a comprehensive, teacher work sample documenting the teacher candidate’s use of all of these assessment tools. The teacher candidate uses content knowledge to plan and implement the integrated thematic unit, motivate and manage students, and assess student learning. Throughout the project, the teacher candidate provides written reflection on student progress as well as her/his own professional development. The rubric used to assess the PTLM highlights competencies aligned with the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. A 100 point rubric is used to rate/score the candidate's project on four components: planning, implementing, assessing, and reflecting. Ratings include: 5 ("proficiently met"), 4 ("adequately met"), 3 ("partially met"), 2 ("minimally met"), and 1 ("not met"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive a rating of at least 4 ("adequately met") on the assessing components in order to demonstrate competency is using assessment methods to document student learning (outcome 4). If the teacher candidate does not demonstrate that she/he has met these performance standards with ratings of at least 4 for each assessing component, an action plan is developed. The university supervisor monitors the teacher candidate's progress in meeting goals outlined in the action plan prior to the completion of student teaching. Teacher candidate mastery of the assessing components must be demonstrated prior to the completion of student teaching and the recommendation for certification.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Plans effectively 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Traditional Program students: 96.33% of candidates met objective 2: Applies knowledge of child development and learning;
Dual Certification Program students: 94.62% of candidates met objective 2: Applies knowledge of child development and learning

M 3: Faculty Ratings: Assessment for Learning (O: 3)

Faculty Ratings for assessment of learning outcome 8 are based on the following: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module: Assessment Component; Student Teaching observation scores: Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 4 Assessment; Final Student Teaching Evaluation: INTASC 8 Assessment of Student Learning; Review of Professional Portfolio: Standard 8 Assessment of Student Learning

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

Traditional Program students: 90.41% of candidates met objective 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning;
Dual Certification Program students: 87.91% of candidates met objective 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning

M 3: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) (O: 1)

Teacher candidates in the ECE BSE Traditional and Dual Certification Programs are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all students in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in the university course work. Teacher candidates have three practicum field experiences prior to their clinical practice (student teaching) with up to 1300 hours of field experiences over the course of the program. The Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) is an overall evaluation of the candidate and is completed by the university supervisor at the end of student teaching, in the course ECE 4661. The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate’s competencies across all 5 learning outcomes and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. The university supervisor rates the candidate based on her/his teaching performance, assignments and professionalism as demonstrated during student teaching, clinical practice. The 5 point rubric includes: 5 ("outstanding"), 4 ("very good"), 3 ("satisfactory"), 2 ("needs improvement") and 1 ("unsatisfactory"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive at least ratings of 3 ("satisfactory") on all indicators in order to complete student teaching, ECE 4661, and be recommended for certification. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 3, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of "C" or better in ECE 4661 is required in order to pass student teaching. This is an end of program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Demonstrates content 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Traditional Program students: 95.43% of candidates met objective 1: Demonstrates content knowledge; Dual Certification Program students: 94.62% of candidates met objective 1: Demonstrates content knowledge

M 4: Faculty Ratings: Professional Reflection (O: 4)
Faculty Ratings for assessment of learning outcome 9 are based on the following: Student Teaching observation scores; Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 6 Professionalism; Final Student Teaching Evaluation: INTASC Standard 9 Professional Commitment and Responsibility; Presentation of Professional Portfolio at Final Student Teaching Conference (The portfolio is aligned to the ten learning outcomes. Prior to student teaching, at three Benchmark Conferences (end of semesters 1, 2, 3), the student is required to present at least two artifacts and rationales per learning outcome as evidence in meeting each of the ten INTASC standards. At the final student teaching conference, the student is required to present at least three additional artifacts and rationales as evidence from the student teaching experience. The data from the presentation is recorded on a Benchmark Conference Form (semesters 1, 2, 3) and serves during the student teaching final conference as information for faculty in rating the student's professional reflection across all standards.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Traditional Program students: 91.67% of candidates met objective 9: Practices professional reflection; Dual Certification Program students: 92.39% of candidates met objective 9: Practices professional reflection

**M 4: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education (O: 4)**

Passing scores on the GACE Content Assessments are required for teacher certification. The following GACE Assessments are required by program: Early Childhood Education (ECE) Traditional Program: Test 001 (Language Arts, Social Studies); Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education) Early Childhood Education and Special Education, General Curriculum (ECE SPE) Dual Certification Program: Test 001 (Language Arts, Social Studies); Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education); Test 081 and 082 (Special Education)

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to document student 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Traditional Program students: 94.52% of candidates met objective 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies; Dual Certification Program students: 91.4% of candidates met objective 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

**M 5: Faculty Ratings: School & Community Relationships (O: 5)**

Faculty Ratings for assessment of learning outcome 10 are based on the following: Documentation of the student teacher’s implementation of a parent conference Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of the student teacher (Appendix D) Final Student Teaching Evaluation: INTASC Standard 10 Partnerships; Review of Professional Portfolio: Standard 10 Partnerships

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: 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 the student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Traditional Program students: 93.5% of candidates met objective 10: Fosters relationships with school and community; Dual Certification Program students: 93.26% of candidates met objective 10: Fosters relationships with school and community

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

**Assessment**

BSE faculty and supervisors will monitor candidates during the third and fourth semester of course work on specific assignments (i.e., Planning, Teaching Learning Sample - 3rd semester; Planning, Teaching, Learning Module - 4th semester student teaching) that target assessment of pupil learning. Supervisors will meet with students to review pupil learning gains, as part of the assessment component of the assignments. Candidates will reflect orally and in writing post observation: Assessment, GA-GSTEP Standard 4. The supervisors will also check field lesson assignments during semesters 1 and 2 with discussions pertaining to pupil learning. At all conferences, supervisors will include the following topics: objective and assessment matching, varied assessment practices, evidence of student learning.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Measure: Faculty Ratings: Assessment for Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSE Faculty and Student Teaching Supervisors

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Child Development

Continue implementing the following action plans: Completion of parent conference assignment, including child portfolio, during Student Teaching. Implementation of developmentally appropriate lessons; supervisor check for implementation. Student Teacher Reflection post observations: Knowledge of Students

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Communication and Technology

Candidates will continue to be required to incorporate technology in student learning as part of their Planning, Teaching, Learning Module assignment. BSE supervisors will observe at least one lesson using creative facets of technology. Candidates will reflect orally and in writing post observation: Communication Skills and Technology; Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP Standard 5.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty Ratings; Communication and Technology | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Content Knowledge

BSE faculty will continue with action plans established in 2007-2008. Emphasis will be placed upon the review of the Professional Portfolio, INTASC Standard 1, GA-GSTEP Standard 1 - Content and Curriculum. Candidates will continue to reflect orally and in writing post observation: Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2009-2010
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Diverse Learners

BSE faculty will provide additional instruction for candidates as part of their Classroom Management course work pertaining to lesson development, specifically, planning and implementing strategies effective in teaching diverse learners. BSE supervisors will monitor the implementation of these strategies during the candidates’ field experiences and student teaching. Supervisors will continue to require candidates to reflect orally and in writing at the post observation conference: Knowledge of Students, GA-GSTEP Domain 2.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: BSE faculty and student teaching supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Instructional Planning

Candidates will continue to plan a 10 day unit; that is, the Planning, Teaching, Learning, Module. This unit will be implemented during student teaching role reversal. Supervisors will check to see that candidates are incorporating multiple instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners. Supervisors will also look for integration of content areas across the curriculum. Candidates will reflect orally and in writing post observation: Planning and Instruction - GA-GSTEP Standard 5.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty Ratings; Planning for Instruction | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Motivation and Management

BSE supervisors will continue to require candidates to implement a classroom center and management plan and will check for implementation. Candidates will continue to reflect orally and in writing post observation: Learning Environments, GA-GSTEP Standard 3.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Multiple Instructional Strategies
BSE faculty will provide additional instruction for candidates as part of their Classroom Management course work pertaining to lesson development, specifically, using multiple instructional strategies. BSE supervisors will monitor the implementation of these strategies during the field experiences and student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: BSE faculty and student teaching supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Professional Reflection
Candidates will reflect orally and in writing post observation at each conference in the presence of their supervisor and cooperating teaching. At each conference, the supervisors will follow up on the goals established by the candidates in the prior meeting. The candidates will present their Professional Portfolio to their supervisor each semester and at the end of student teaching documenting reflection across all GA-STEP Domains and INTASC Standards.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Field Experience and Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

School and Community Relationships
Candidates will continue to provide documentation and written reflection to their supervisor during student teaching regarding the implementation of at least one parent conference. BSE faculty will also provide opportunities for candidates to take advantage of Professional Development opportunities; that is, presenting at a social studies and literacy conference; working with instructors to coordinate a school Math and/or Science Fair.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty Ratings: School & Community Relationships | Outcome/Objective: Fosters relationships with school and community
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: BSE Faculty and Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
BSE supervisors will receive professional development during the 2009-2010 academic year in order to be effective mentors in following up on the proposed action plans. S.O.S. (Support of Supervisors) Meetings will be held once a month each fall and spring semester for supervisors. The meetings will be facilitated by the program coordinator. Specific topics will address the proposed action plans. Additionally, management course instructors will provide additional instruction for candidates on lesson development using new lesson plan formats and focusing on the implementation of strategies effective in teaching diverse groups of learners. Supervisors will follow up in the field.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Changes in the BSED (undergraduate program) that reflect data and policy changes in 2008-2009 include the following: In review of faculty ratings of student performance across all ten learning outcomes, BSE faculty identified two standards, standard 3 (Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners) and standard 8 (Understands and uses assessment for learning), where ratings were the lowest: Ninety-one percent (91%) of Dual Certification Program candidates and ninety percent (90%) of Traditional Program candidates demonstrated a proficient level of understanding of standard 3, down by 9% (Dual) and 5% (Traditional) from 2007 – 2008. BSE
Goals

G 1: Candidates Display Content Knowledge
Candidates are expected to master content standards based on program learning objectives. They must understand the early childhood competencies and be able to apply this knowledge to diverse age groups and children who have varied educational abilities and developmental needs. Candidates will be able to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate knowledge to communicate effectively with diverse children and families (For a complete listing of learning standards and objectives, please see the Georgia Early Learning Standards (GELS) or the {Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC} website).

G 2: Candidates Will Use Standards-Based Practices
Candidates are expected to use standards-based practices to positively impact children's learning and development. Standards-based practices include those for guiding children's behavior (behavior management) and for instructional management (the assessing, planning, teaching, assessing feedback loop). The B-5 program offers coursework and clinical practice that is evidence-based and reflects the highest professional and ethical standards of the field. The {National Association for Early Childhood} (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood {DEC/CEC}) provide the national standards for initial teacher licensure which serve as the framework for the B-5 program, including course content, candidate learning outcomes, measures and assessment, and program evaluation. Professional standards will also be the criteria for candidate's continual reflection and self-assessment.

G 3: Candidates Will Model Professional Collaboration
Candidates will demonstrate skills in working as a team to promote optimal student learning and development. Candidates must also display positive dispositions to communicate with and learn from diverse stakeholders, including family members, coworkers, and other specialized professionals. The B-5 program design and implementation reflects collaboration among specialists and the integration of multiple disciplines such as early childhood education, special education, nursing, health, physical therapy, speech and hearing, counseling, and others. Candidates will learn to use a collaborative model to plan educational experiences for young children and families, particularly those who have special education needs (IEP for school age children; ISFP for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers).

G 4: Candidates Work Effectively with Diverse Populations
Candidates will be expected to demonstrate abilities in working with diverse groups. These abilities include multicultural sensitivity, anti-bias practices, and culturally responsive child caring techniques. The Birth Through Five BSED program provides coursework and field experiences with diverse age groups and with children who have varied educational abilities and developmental needs. Candidates will be awarded the Preschool Education Endorsement and graduate with strong competencies for working with children with disabilities and their families. Couse content and field experiences are also planned which offer opportunities to learn about and work with children and adults from diverse cultural/ethnic and language groups.

G 1: Candidates Display Content Knowledge
Candidates must demonstrate their knowledge of how young children develop concepts and skills in language and literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies. These content standards are outlined in the Georgia Early Learning Standards (GELS) for children birth-three; Georgia Pre-K content standards for four years old; and Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) for Kindergarten students. Additionally, candidates must be able to effectively use content standards in order to plan and implement meaningful learning experiences. These meaningful experiences are referred to as "developmentally appropriate practice (DAP)" or developmentally effective practice. Such practice requires that teachers take into account 1) knowledge of general child development, 2) knowledge of the individual child, and 3) knowledge of the child's cultural background.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Promotes child development and learning (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Candidates use their understanding of young children's characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children's development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for all children.
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
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Builds family-community relationships (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children's families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children's development and learning.

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
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

SLO 3: Uses assessments to support learning/development (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Candidates know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence children's development and learning.

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
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 Contribute to the greater community good
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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Demonstrates effective teaching methods (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Candidates integrate their understanding of and relationships with children and families; their understanding of developmentally effective approaches to teaching and learning; and their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for all children.

**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
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Exhibits professional and ethical conduct (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Candidates identify and conduct themselves as members of the early childhood profession. They know and use ethical guidelines and other professional standards related to early childhood practice. They are continuous, collaborative learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on their work, making informed decisions that integrate knowledge from a variety of sources. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
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
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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: e-Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Candidates construct a professional e-portfolio (LiveText) of work products (artifacts) and reflective narratives (rationales), organized around the five initial teacher licensure standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the ten standards of the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). These standards complement each other and together form the knowledge, skills and dispositions of a competent Birth-Five professional. Candidates are introduced to the standard-based e-portfolio in BRFV 3250 Professional and Ethical Practice. A variety of artifacts are collected each semester and submitted periodically to course instructors to demonstrate the candidate’s understanding of these professional standards and how they meet the standards. The artifacts include assignments from college courses, work setting or field placements. Artifacts/rationales are by reviewed (formative rubric) by candidate's course instructors, peers, field supervisors, and center teachers and administrators. The e-portfolio is rated at the end of the program during the student teaching placement/internship by the clinical supervisor to assess the candidate’s overall mastery of program standards (summative rubric).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Promotes child development and learning**

85% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on Standard 1 (Child Development/Learning) of the professional portfolio evaluation rubric. This rubric is aligned with the state and national standards for the preparation of B-5 professionals. The rubric allows the evaluator to assess knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidate’s ability to promote child development and learning through their self-selected teacher work samples. The summative assessment of the e-portfolio is completed during the student teaching/internship semester by the university supervisor.
### Georgia State University
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#### Mission / Purpose

Normal 0 false false false 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.) endorsement. Successful graduates may also apply 18 credit hours toward Ph.D. program in ECE after admission to doctoral program.

#### Goals

**G 1: Teachers as Researchers**

Normal 0 false false false The primary professional responsibility for each successful candidate in the Ed.S. program is to become researchers and leaders who use data to inform their policies, practices, procedures and beliefs.

**G 2: Teachers as Learner-Centered Practitioners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B-5 program was initiated fall, 2008. No findings are available for 2008-09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Builds family-community relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or &quot;exceeds expectations&quot; on Standard 2 (Family/Community Relations) of the professional portfolio evaluation rubric. This rubric is aligned with the state and national standards for the preparation of B-5 professionals. The rubric allows the evaluator to assess knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidate's ability to build meaningful family-community relationships through their self-selected teacher work samples. The summative assessment of the e-portfolio is completed during the student teaching/internship semester by the university supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B-5 program was initiated fall, 2008. No findings are available for 2008-09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Uses assessments to support learning/development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or &quot;exceeds expectations&quot; on Standard 3 (Assessment) of the professional portfolio evaluation rubric. This rubric is aligned with the state and national standards for the preparation of B-5 professionals. The rubric allows the evaluator to assess knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidate's ability to use appropriate observation and assessment tools and strategies through their self-selected teacher work samples. The summative assessment of the e-portfolio is completed during the student teaching/internship semester by the university supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B-5 program was initiated fall, 2008. No findings are available for 2008-09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Demonstrates effective teaching methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or &quot;exceeds expectations&quot; on Standard 4 (Teaching/Learning) of the professional portfolio evaluation rubric. This rubric is aligned with the state and national standards for the preparation of B-5 professionals. The rubric allows the evaluator to assess knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidate's ability to use developmentally appropriate methods and materials for young children through their self-selected teacher work samples. The summative assessment of the e-portfolio is completed during the student teaching/internship semester by the university supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B-5 program was initiated fall, 2008. No findings are available for 2008-09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Exhibits professional and ethical conduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will earn a minimum rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or &quot;exceeds expectations&quot; on Standard 5 (Professionalism) of the professional portfolio evaluation rubric. This rubric is aligned with the state and national standards for the preparation of B-5 professionals. The rubric allows the evaluator to assess knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidate's ability to exhibit high standards of professional and ethical conduct through their self-selected teacher work samples. The summative assessment of the e-portfolio is completed during the student teaching/internship semester by the university supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B-5 program was initiated fall, 2008. No findings are available for 2008-09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ed.S. program is based on the assumption that learning is a constructive process that builds on the knowledge and experience of the learner. We provide graduates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to serve as effective educational leaders and decision makers in their schools and communities. Thus, learning and teacher education curriculum must be fundamentally connected to the school and classroom.

**G 3: Teachers as Professional Learners**
Teachers adapt to the changing needs of the school and their own growth as quality educators.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 1:</strong> Shows commitment to learning and development (M: 1, 4, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #1 PSC Standard Domain: Effects on P-12 Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></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><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 2:</strong> Applies expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #2 PSC Standard Domain: Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></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><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 3:</strong> Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3 PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</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><strong>SLO 4:</strong> Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience (M: 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #4 PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</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><strong>SLO 5:</strong> Participates in professional learning communities (M: 1, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #5 PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
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: STARS NBPTS Survey (O: 1, 3, 5)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Program instructors complete STARS NBPTS Advanced Program Survey using formative and summative data collected throughout the program at two times (midyear- end of fall semester and end of program-summer 2). The midyear STARS data is now used (as of 2008-2009) as evidence for program exit for TSS completion and the end of the program STARS data is used for follow-through and as EdS program exit point. Students also complete STARS independently at these two points.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development
Each EdS participant is rated by the EdS program faculty in team discussions on elements of each standard to total 17 items. Each item is rated using the following scoring guide: 1.0 Not demonstrated 2.0 Novice, with support/guidance 3.0 Novice, independent 4.0 Intermediate 5.0 Advanced Targets: Midyear-Novice, Independent (3>; End of the Program-Intermediate (4>)

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Data Table: STARS NBPTS Advanced Program Survey for Faculty 2007-2008 End of Program Summer 2008 N=19 2008-2009 Midpoint Program January 2009 N=20 Average Rating % at or above Target Average Rating % at or above Target Disposition 4.3 92.98% 3.05 97.5% Diversity 4.37 100% 3.03 97.5% Planning 4.19 96.49% 3.33 98.33% PSC: Clinical Practice NCATE: Professional & Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills 4.20 90.79% 3.04 98.75% PSC: Knowledge NCATE: Content Knowledge 4.16 91.05% 3.14 98.5% PSC: Performance NCATE: Pedagogical Content Knowledge 4.42 100% 3.05% 100% Student Learning 4.19 95.79% 3.02% 99%

Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
Each EdS participant is rated by the EdS program faculty in team discussions on elements of each standard to total 17 items. Each item is rated using the following scoring guide: 1.0 Not demonstrated 2.0 Novice, with support/guidance 3.0 Novice, independent 4.0 Intermediate 5.0 Advanced Targets: Midyear-Novice, Independent (3>; End of the Program-Intermediate (4>)

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Data Table: STARS NBPTS Advanced Program Survey for Faculty 2007-2008 End of Program Summer 2008 N=19 2008-2009 Midpoint Program January 2009 N=20 Average Rating % at or above Target Average Rating % at or above Target Disposition 4.3 92.98% 3.05 97.5% Diversity 4.37 100% 3.03 97.5% Planning 4.19 96.49% 3.33 98.33% PSC: Clinical Practice NCATE: Professional & Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills 4.20 90.79% 3.04 98.75% PSC: Knowledge NCATE: Content Knowledge 4.16 91.05% 3.14 98.5% PSC: Performance NCATE: Pedagogical Content Knowledge 4.42 100% 3.05% 100% Student Learning 4.19 95.79% 3.02% 99%

Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities
Each EdS participant is rated by the EdS program faculty in team discussions on elements of each standard to total 17 items. Each item is rated using the following scoring guide: 1.0 Not demonstrated 2.0 Novice, with support/guidance 3.0 Novice, independent 4.0 Intermediate 5.0 Advanced Targets: Midyear-Novice, Independent (3>; End of the Program-Intermediate (4>)

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Data Table: STARS NBPTS Advanced Program Survey for Faculty 2007-2008 End of Program Summer 2008 N=19 2008-2009 Midpoint Program January 2009 N=20 Average Rating % at or above Target Average Rating % at or above Target Disposition 4.3 92.98% 3.05 97.5% Diversity 4.37 100% 3.03 97.5% Planning 4.19 96.49% 3.33 98.33% PSC: Clinical Practice NCATE: Professional & Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills 4.20 90.79% 3.04 98.75% PSC: Knowledge NCATE: Content Knowledge 4.16 91.05% 3.14 98.5% PSC: Performance NCATE: Pedagogical Content Knowledge 4.42 100% 3.05% 100% Student Learning 4.19 95.79% 3.02% 99%

M 2: Evaluation of Ed.S. Supervisor by Intern (O: 2, 3)
Preservice teachers rate their college supervisors on the ECE Supervisor Evaluation Form (Please see Appendix G, pp.91-92 in the Traditional Student Teaching Handbook). This is a 16 item instrument with 12 items designed using a 5 point Likert scale with 5 = strongly agree and 1= strongly disagree. Sample items address whether or not: supervisors had clear plans of action for every conference, gave relevant and ongoing feedback, were knowledgeable and professional and so forth. The remaining 4 items invite respondents to comment upon supervisor strengths, weaknesses, whether or not they would recommend the supervisor and finally, observations of overall supervisory performance.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development
Preservice teachers rate their college supervisors on the ECE Supervisor Evaluation Form (Please see Appendix G, pp.91-92 in the Traditional Student Teaching Handbook). This is a 16 item instrument with 12 items designed using a 5 point Likert scale with 5 = strongly agree and 1= strongly disagree. Sample items address whether or not: supervisors had clear plans of action for every conference, gave relevant and ongoing feedback, were knowledgeable and professional and so forth. The remaining 4 items invite respondents to comment upon supervisor strengths, weaknesses, whether or not they would recommend the supervisor and finally, observations of overall supervisory performance.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Qualitative Data Preservice teachers found their EdS supervisors to be informative, flexible, caring, accessible and patient. Feedback was viewed as constructive, thorough and meaningful, maximizing field placement experiences. Supervisory interactions were characterized as communicative, professional, collaborative and non-threatening. Quantitative Data The overall mean ratings of EdS supervisors on items 1-12 for the combined 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 EdS Teacher Groups was 4.80. These very positive ratings compare favorably to their ECE PTI Supervisor counterparts who received an overall mean rating of 4.61. Even though the mean score of 4.8 is very high, one unusual extreme score was found in an analysis of group range for EdS combined scores. When the outlier is removed from analysis, the revised mean increases to 4.89.

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

Preservice teachers rate their college supervisors on the ECE Supervisor Evaluation Form (Please see Appendix G, pp.91-92 in the Traditional Student Teaching Handbook). This is a 10 item instrument with 12 items designed using a 5 point Likert scale with 5 = strongly agree and 1 = strongly disagree. Sample items address whether or not: supervisors had clear plans of action for every conference, gave relevant and ongoing feedback, were knowledgeable and professional and so forth. The remaining 4 items invite respondents to comment upon supervisor strengths, weaknesses, whether or not they would recommend the supervisor and finally, observations of overall supervisory performance.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Qualified Data Preservice teachers found their EdS supervisors to be informative, flexible, caring, accessible and patient. Feedback was viewed as constructive, thorough and meaningful, maximizing field placement experiences. Supervisory interactions were characterized as communicative, professional, collaborative and non-threatening. Quantitative Data The overall mean ratings of EdS supervisors on items 1-12 for the combined 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 EdS Teacher Groups was 4.80. These very positive ratings compare favorably to their ECE PTI Supervisor counterparts who received an overall mean rating of 4.61. Even though the mean score of 4.8 is very high, one unusual extreme score was found in an analysis of group range for EdS combined scores. When the outlier is removed from analysis, the revised mean increases to 4.89.

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

The academic performance of all students is evaluated toward the end of the fall semester when the summative report is due. Using the rubric for scoring, candidates must receive at least a B or better (42 points out of 50) to show evidence of meeting the standards. Students who fall below this meet with program faculty and set up an action plan for remediation including report revisions and/or extension of time needed to complete the report to the level of quality that is expected.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Supervision Summative Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard Fall 2007 (n=19) 45.8 out of total of 50 29.0 to 50 84% Clinical Practice Effects on Student Learning Fall 2008 (n=19) 46.10 out of total of 50 43.0 to 50 100% Clinical Practice Effects on Student Learning

**Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities**

The academic performance of all students is evaluated toward the end of the fall semester when the summative report is due. Using the rubric for scoring, candidates must receive at least a B or better (42 points out of 50) to show evidence of meeting the standards. Students who fall below this meet with program faculty and set up an action plan for remediation including report revisions and/or extension of time needed to complete the report to the level of quality that is expected.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Supervision Summative Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard Fall 2007 (n=19) 45.8 out of total of 50 29.0 to 50 84% Clinical Practice Effects on Student Learning Fall 2008 (n=19) 46.10 out of total of 50 43.0 to 50 100% Clinical Practice Effects on Student Learning

**M 4: Capstone Experience (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The capstone experience is designed by faculty and participants to provide final reflection and documentation of an individual's work and accomplishments toward program objectives. As the culminating experience, it incorporates: self- and peer- assessment, reflection, and presentation of action research project to an outside audience.

**Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development**

Capstone project is assessed using a detailed rubric that scores the project using a Likert scale of O (not demonstrated) to 5 (Excellent) for proposal, experience and reflection. Students must demonstrate an overall score of 3 of better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully completed the capstone experience with a grade of A- or better.

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**

Capstone project is assessed using a detailed rubric that scores the project using a Likert scale of O (not demonstrated) to 5 (Excellent) for proposal, experience and reflection. Students must demonstrate an overall score of 3 of better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully completed the capstone experience with a grade of A- or better.
**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

Capstone project is assessed using a detailed rubric that scores the project using a Likert scale of O (not demonstrated) to 5 (Excellent) for proposal, experience and reflection. Students must demonstrate an overall score of 3 of better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully completed the capstone experience with a grade of A- or better.

---

**Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities**

Capstone project is assessed using a detailed rubric that scores the project using a Likert scale of O (not demonstrated) to 5 (Excellent) for proposal, experience and reflection. Students must demonstrate an overall score of 3 of better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully completed the capstone experience with a grade of A- or better.

---

**M 5: Action Research Project (O: 2, 3, 4)**

The goal of action research is for teacher-researchers to solve educational problems by engaging in a systematic process of inquiry. This process enables teachers-researchers to make informed decisions at both the classroom and school level. In the Ed.S. program, you will conduct an action research project in your classroom thereby helping you bridge theory and practice. The project enables candidates to solve an educational problem as well as encourages the role of reflective practitioner. The project begins during the first semester and be carried out throughout the Ed.S program.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**

Students are assessed using a rubric that details quality performance across categories required in the project. A total of 100 points are given. Target is B or better on the project (80+).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Action Research Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard 2007-2008 93.3 out of total of 100 87 to 100 100% Content Knowledge Planning Effects on Student Learning

---

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

Students are assessed using a rubric that details quality performance across categories required in the project. A total of 100 points are given. Target is B or better on the project (80+).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Action Research Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard 2007-2008 93.3 out of total of 100 87 to 100 100% Content Knowledge Planning Effects on Student Learning

---

**Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

Students are assessed using a rubric that details quality performance across categories required in the project. A total of 100 points are given. Target is B or better on the project (80+).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Action Research Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard 2007-2008 93.3 out of total of 100 87 to 100 100% Content Knowledge Planning Effects on Student Learning

---

**M 6: Content GPA (O: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The content knowledge GPA is computed every semester with the expectation that the student maintains a 3.0 or better to make informed decisions in the program. This assessment is directly related to the PSC/NBPTS standards. Discrete assessment data is used in the courses and designed to ensure these standards are assessed. Specifically, final grades for the two key courses (ECE 8400, ECE 8680) are used in providing evidence of meeting TSS standards.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development**

The academic performance of all students is evaluated after each semester (summer 1, fall, spring, summer 2). Criterion for program continuation includes maintaining a GPA of 3.0 or better. Students who fall below this meet with program faculty and set up an action plan for remediation

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Content GPA 2006-2007 Comparison group prior to new program start in summer 2007 (n=20) 2008-2009 Program completers from 2007-2008, exited end of summer 2008 (n=19) Average Ext GPA 3.92 3.93 Standard Deviation .11 .08 Low GPA 3.69 3.72 Hgh GPA 4.0 4.0 Range .31 .28

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**

The academic performance of all students is evaluated after each semester (summer 1, fall, spring, summer 2). Criterion for program continuation includes maintaining a GPA of 3.0 or better. Students who fall below this meet with program faculty and set up an action plan for remediation

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Content GPA 2006-2007 Comparison group prior to new program start in summer 2007 (n=20) 2008-2009 Program completers from 2007-2008, exited end of summer 2008 (n=19) Average Ext GPA 3.92 3.93 Standard Deviation .11
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Research Cycle
Data reported here represents program completers from summer 2008. Shift cycle to match PSC for 2009-2010 and participants who enter summer 2009 and complete coursework in summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010. There will be no expected program completers for next report cycle as this group will not complete the action research project until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Capstone Cycle
Data reported here represents program completers from summer 2008. Shift cycle to match PSC for 2009-2010 and participants who enter summer 2009 and complete coursework in summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010. There will be no expected program completers for next report cycle as this group will not complete the capstone until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Capstone Experience | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Electronic Worksamples
The program is moving to pilot a system for electronic collection of work samples and key assessments for the program for future management, analysis and reporting purposes. The program will pilot livetext with ECE 8800 in summer 2010 to meet this goal.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Supervision Summative Report | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

STARS Survey
Revise use of STARS survey with new unit conceptual framework.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: STARS NBPTS Survey | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The EdS program will execute the following strategies to meet our goals for this year: 1. Shift the program assessment cycle for Weave to match the same cycle as set for Professional Standards Commission (PAArs report). For next Weave report, we will document and assess data for 2009-2010 for the cohort that entered in the program in summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010. There will be no expected program completers for this cycle as they complete program requirements in summer 2010 and will be listed on the next cycle. 2. Implement new program assessment plan based on changes and findings from this year. 3. Change grading option for internship course (ECE 8680) and capstone experience (ECE 8800) to S/U. 4. Pilot livetext data management system with ECE 8800 in summer 2010.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Recent review of the TSS endorsement portion of the program by the Professional Standards Commission in April 2009 resulted in refinement of the 2008-2009 Program Assessment Plan. Previously, the TSS endorsement was embedded in the program. Based on the revisions, we now have specific performance indicators and assessments specific to the TSS standards. Some of these key assessments also serve to inform EdS program standards. Consequently, we have added several new assessment tools including:
Content GPA 2. Evaluation of EdS Supervisor by Preservice Teacher 3. Supervision Summative report Analysis of these new measures are included in this report. In addition, we have continued to collect data on year 2 of the new program during 2008-2009 and have refined the rubrics used for the Action Research Project and Capstone Experience. We matched specific program assignments with individual items in STARS survey to help provide greater variability across ratings. Teachers conduct action research projects in their classrooms as a program requirement. In the past, all teachers were required to receive CITI training on Research with Human Subjects and receive IRB approval. Teachers also had to receive project approval through her/his school district IRB procedures. Program faculty worked with IRB office this year to streamline this process to meet compliance issues but support a more feasible timeline for completion. New procedures begin with the next teacher cohort (summer 2009). Finally, because of new program review requirements by the Professional Standards Commission and the use of virtual exhibits, we recognize the need to develop a system for the collection of work samples as one set of data for analysis and reporting. Several faculty have attended professional learning sessions on the use of livetext for this purpose.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

**What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.**

1. STARS Survey as Measure Aligned with NBPTS In an effort to provide variability in STARS ratings among participants, program faculty met twice during the program (midpoint-January and end of summer-program completion) specifically to discuss and rate each participant on individual STARS items in relation to discrete course assignments and/or courses. Despite these efforts to have more accurate STARS data for each participant, we still do not have any significant range in scores. Because the unit is currently revising the conceptual framework and hence the STARS measure may be revised, we are holding off any additional adjustments using STARS. 2. Wiki One of our action items from 2007-2008 report was to develop formal mechanism to assess the virtual learning community and our wiki. We did not develop any formal measures this year and instead concentrated on including discrete performance indicators specific to TSS standards (see question 1). However, anecdotal evidence indicates that the wiki serves as a good tool for alternative delivery model used in this program and allow easy access, communication and content integration among program faculty and teacher participants. 3. Application of Program Content In revising the 2008-2009 Program Assessment Plan to parse out specific indicators for the TSS portion of the program, we discovered that there was considerable overlap in some assessments across two key courses: ECE 8400 (Teacher Development) and ECE 8680 (Internship). Consequently, we have corrected this in the program sequence and the internship course has been revised so that the content remains the focus of the ECE 8400 course (summer) and application of the content in schools the focus of the ECE 8680 (fall). We also will propose a grading change option of S/U for the two application courses in the program; ECE 8680 Internship and ECE 8880 Capstone. Currently, these courses receive a letter grade.

**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 UACM is a rigorous program that seeks to promote the success of elementary students schooled in urban contexts through the development of pedagogically competent, equity-oriented, caring, empowered teachers who are change agents inside and outside the classroom.

The UACM beliefs:

- We believe that teachers have the ability and power to provide experiences in which children succeed. This success provides the confidence and competence for children to continue to succeed.

- We believe that in order to foster these successful experiences, teachers must engage and connect with students. This connection is demonstrated by treating children with respect, by having high standards and by helping children to believe that they can achieve.

- We believe that in order to foster successful experiences, teachers must be knowledgeable about the child’s culture and must actively integrate this into the best practices of teaching and learning.

- We believe that from structure comes freedom. The teacher must create a purposeful, structured environment in which children are free to explore, experiment, and learn.

- We believe that teachers need to establish an environment in their classrooms where children are respectful of each other, their environment and the adults in their lives.

- We believe that teachers should respect the language of their children and have knowledge of its background and
principles. We also believe that teachers should model and expect mastery of mainstream American English for their students.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**  
Teacher candidates will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the curriculum they teach.

**G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills**  
Teacher candidates will have the pedagogical knowledge and skills to be able to plan and implement effective instruction.

**G 3: Student Learning**  
Teacher candidates will use varied assessment techniques and critical reflection to increase student achievement.

**G 4: Diversity**  
Teacher candidates will meet the cultural, linguistic, learning, and behavioral differences of all learners.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**  
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**

1.12 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  
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  
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources  
4.43 Effective utilization of resources  
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)  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Applies knowledge of child development (G: 4) (M: 2)**  
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**

1.12 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  
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  
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources  
4.43 Effective utilization of resources  
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)  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners (G: 4) (M: 3)**  
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**

1.12 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  
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success  
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources  
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 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>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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43 Effective utilization of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 New Academic Programs (&amp; Modes of Delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 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>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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43 Effective utilization of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 New Academic Programs (&amp; Modes of Delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 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>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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43 Effective utilization of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 New Academic Programs (&amp; Modes of Delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Effectively plans for instruction (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 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>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
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)
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 8: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 3) (M: 8)**

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**

1.12 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
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
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
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)
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Practices professional reflection (G: 3) (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**

1.12 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
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
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
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)
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 10: Fosters relationships with school and community (G: 4) (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**

1.12 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
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
4.42 Development of alternative (non-state) resources
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
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)
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating 1- Content Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 1)**

Content Knowledge of candidates is assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little or no assistance and supervision from professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

96% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Content Knowledge standard.

**M 2: Faculty Rating 2 - Child Development (O: 2)**

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Child Development are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Child Case Study and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Child Development standard.

**M 3: Faculty Rating 3 - Diverse Groups of Learners (O: 3)**

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Teaching Diverse Groups of Learners are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Student Support Team Project, and b.) Field Experience Observations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Diverse Groups of Learners standard.

**M 4: Faculty Rating 4-Multiple Instructional Strategies (O: 4)**

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Multiple Instructional Strategies are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. Faculty ratings are candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) ELL Responsive Instruction Analysis, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 or no assistance and supervision from professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Multiple Instructional Strategies standard.

**M 5: Faculty Rating 5 - Motivate and Manage Students (O: 5)**

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Motivating and Managing Students are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: Motivate and Manage Students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Motivate and Manage Students standard.

**M 6: Faculty Rating 6 - Communication Skills and Techno (O: 6)**
Candidates' knowledge and skills of Communication Skills and Technology are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Critical Discourse Analysis, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**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 or no assistance and supervision from professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Communication Skills and Technology standard.

### M 7: Faculty Rating 7 - Plan for Instruction (O: 7)

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Plan for Instruction are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Integrated Thematic Unit, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O7: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Plan for Instruction standard.

### M 8: Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning (O: 8)

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Assessment for Learning are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Mathematics Teaching and Learning Project, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**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 or no assistance and supervision from professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

88% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Assessment for Learning standard.

### M 9: Faculty Rating 9 - Professional Reflection (O: 9)

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Professional Reflection are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Culturally Responsive Synthesis Paper, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O9: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Professional Reflection standard.

### M 10: Faculty Rating 10 - Professional Relationships (O: 10)

Candidates' knowledge and skills of Professional Relationships are assessed by faculty and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. Faculty ratings of candidates are based on the following assessments: a.) Parent Communication Letter, and b.) Field Experience Observation.

**Target for O10: 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 professors, university supervisor, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently through course assignments and in a field setting. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/end of program, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of teacher candidates achieved satisfactory or better on the Professional Relationships standard.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Add EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment**

To address the not met Standard 8 - Assessment for Learning, the program will replace one of the three Action Research courses in the current Program of Study with EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment. By adding this course to the program of study, candidates will be better prepared to create, implement, analyze, and use assessment in ways that enhance student learning.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We plan to offer this course for the first time during the summer 2010 semester.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Add Lesson Planning/Assessment to Opening School Experience Orientation**

The program will add Lesson Planning and Assessment to the Opening School Experience Orientation agenda. This will allow candidates to have an earlier introduction to the importance of assessment in lesson planning and student learning. At this time Blooms Taxonomy will also be introduced to candidates to enhance lessons and assessments so that they are planned at higher levels of cognitive demand.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The Opening School Experience Orientation occurs in July of each year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Monitor and Maintain**

Currently the Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program has met all of its objectives except Standard 8 - Assessment for Learning. 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an on-going action Plan for the program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

**What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?**

In addition to the specific strategies describe in Academic Question 2, the program will implement the following strategies to support our ability to meet our goals and objectives: 1. We will add Assessment as an agenda item to each of our monthly program meetings to keep our efforts on target. 2. We will streamline our data collection efforts through the improvement of our data collection forms and database. 3. We will pilot the use of LiveText. LiveText (Accreditation Management System) provides programs with user-friendly web-based tools for developing, assessing, and measuring student learning. LiveText helps assure commitment to accountability, continuous improvement, and excellence in education.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

**What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?**

The Early Childhood Education GATAPP program has made the following changes since last year’s assessment report: 1. The Early
Childhood Education GATAPP program has requested the addition of 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. We currently have approval at the college, unit, and university level. The program will go through the State of Georgia's 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 Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program. 2. The Early Childhood Education GATAPP 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. Currently, the program has secured commitment from four DeKalb County schools (Idlewood, McLendon, McNair Discovery Academy, and Woodward Elementary Schools) to serve as program PDSs. We have started work with three of the four schools, and we will start work with the fourth school (Woodward Elementary) in the spring of 2010.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program has met all of its objectives except Objective 8 - Assessment for Learning. Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective. Additionally, the program faculty has set following two Action Plan for the 2009-2010 academic year to address Objective 8 - Assessment for Learning: 1. The Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program will replace one of the three Action Research courses in the current Program of Study with EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment. By adding this course to the program of study, candidates will be better prepared to create, implement, analyze, and use assessment in ways that enhance student learning. 2. The Early Childhood Education GATAPP Program will add Lesson Planning and Assessment to the Opening School Experience Orientation agenda. This will allow candidates to have an earlier introduction to the importance of assessment in lesson planning and student learning. At this time Blooms Taxonomy will also be introduced to candidates to encourage that lessons and assessments be planned at higher levels of cognitive demand.

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

**Mission / Purpose**

This program is based on the assumption that learning is a constructive process which builds on the knowledge and experience of the learner. Through an integrated approach that provides choices and opportunities for decision making and dynamic group interactions, teachers participating in the Collaborative Masters Program become partners with faculty in shaping the path(s) by which content is learned. Students enrolled in the Collaborative Program receive a Masters in Education Degree in Early Childhood Education. In 2008-2009, 18 students completed the program and were awarded this degree.

**Goals**

**G 1: teachers will become empowered**

Teachers will become empowered as instructional decision makers.

**G 2: teachers will advocate for students' instructional needs**

Teachers will advocate for instruction that addresses the needs of their students.

**G 3: teachers will advocate for educational justice**

Teachers will advocate for educational justice for all students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Educators manage and monitor student learning. (M: 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.

Relevant Associations: This objective is from National Board Performance Teaching Standard

**SLO 2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge. (M: 2, 3)**

Educators have mastery over the subject(s) they teach and the skill and experience in teaching the subject(s).

Relevant Associations: This outcome is from National Board Teaching Performance Standards

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Educators reflect on their practice. (M: 1, 2)**

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: This objective is from NBPTS

**O/O 4: Educator will collaborate with peers and others. (M: 2)**

Educators collaborate with others to improve student learning and they know how to work collaboratively with parents.

Relevant Associations: This objective is from NBPTS

**O/O 5: Educator will show commitment to student learning. (M: 2)**

Educators are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn and they understand how students develop and learn. They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.

Relevant Associations: This objective is from NBPTS

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Benchmark (O: 3)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: 3 students received 2/3 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.83. Therefore students as a whole met target

**M 2: Capstone (O: 2, 3, 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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: 3 students received 2/3 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.83. Therefore students as a whole met target.

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: 3 students received 2/3 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.83. Therefore students as a whole met target.

**Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: 4 students received 2/3 14 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.78. Therefore students as a whole met target.

**Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: all 18 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 3, therefore students as a whole met target.

**M 3: Field Visit (O: 1, 2)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Educators manage and monitor student learning.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. For a scale of 1-3 that level is 2.40

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Out of 18 students: 1 students received 2/3 17 students received 3/3 Average score for 18 is 2.94. 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.

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

**Examine literature on achievement gap between majority and minority students.**

During the Glue classes attention will be directed toward examining reasons behind the achievement gap between majority and minority students. Students will read a variety of texts and hold classroom discussions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Students will be given their first reading related to the achievement gap at the first glue class in August.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The two program directors will be responsible for selecting readings and for leading the discussions.

**Incorporate monthly video clubs**

Teachers will meet 1 Wednesday of each month with their video club groups. The focus of the clubs is on the student – teacher language interactions. Each teacher will seek feedback on her language interactions during either a math, literacy, community lesson.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Introduce video clubs to students at first glue class in August
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lynn Hart will take the lead. Three faculty in the program: Lynn Hart, Julie Dangel, and Mona Matthews will visit each video club one time during the year
- **Additional Resources:** we submitted a proposal requesting technology funds to purchase cameras

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

1. Students demonstrated increased skill in working with a variety of technology. They were asked to include at least one element of their Capstone using an alternative to a written form. They shared these elements at the end of the program during a Museum Walk. Their creativity and depth of illustrations of their learning were remarked on by other faculty in the department. Program Directors also were impressed. 2. Students demonstrated more sensitivity to the needs of their students. This increased sensitivity was evident in their nontraditional Capstone element as well as in written components of their Capstones. Students created profiles of their students and their classrooms which demonstrated: value for student diversity and classroom community.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2008-2009 Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The UACM is a rigorous program that seeks to serve the needs and aspirations of elementary students schooled in urban contexts by eradicating deficit perspectives through the development of pedagogically competent, equity-oriented, empowered teachers who are change agents inside and outside the classroom.

The UACM beliefs:

- We believe that teachers have the ability and power to provide experiences in which children succeed. This success provides the confidence and competence for children to continue to succeed.
• We believe that in order to foster these successful experiences, teachers must engage and connect with students. This connection is demonstrated by treating children with respect, by having high standards and by helping children to believe that they can achieve.

• We believe that in order to foster successful experiences, teachers must be knowledgeable about the child’s culture and must actively integrate this into the best practices of teaching and learning.

• We believe that from structure comes freedom. The teacher must create a purposeful, structured environment in which children are free to explore, experiment, and learn.

• We believe that teachers need to establish an environment in their classrooms where children are respectful of each other, their environment and the adults in their lives.

• We believe that teachers should respect the language of their children and have knowledge of its background and principles. We also believe that teachers should model and expect mastery of mainstream American English for their students.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge ans Skills**
Master's candidates will have the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to be able to plan and implement effective, culturally responsive instruction.

**G 2: Teaching as a Profession**
Master's candidates will develop as reflective and collaborative professionals.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Shows commitment to student learning & development (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Educator is committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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

**SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development (G: 1) (M: 2)**
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**

1.12 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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (G: 1) (M: 3)**
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA
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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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

SLO 4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning (G: 2) (M: 4)
The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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

SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (G: 2) (M: 5)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.
Relevant Associations: NBPTS, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 1)
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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Shows commitment to student learning & development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
92% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 2: Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop (O: 2)
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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
91% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 3: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning (O: 3)
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 O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
90% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 4: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship (O: 4)
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 O4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
94% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

M 5: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities (O: 5)
Scores on the following assessments are combined into faculty ratings for completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5: a). Cross Career Learning Community, and b). Capstone Project

Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
97% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

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

Add MEd Orientation to Summer Semester
The program faculty will add a MEd Orientation to the summer semester prior to starting ECE course work in the Master's year of the Program of Study. The orientation will focus on the program schedule and major activities/projects. The major activities/projects include: the mentorship experience and the capstone project. Candidates will also be introduced to the program text (The New Teacher), which will be read across all of their ECE courses. This orientation will allow candidates to grasp the Master's program scope and sequence prior to starting their career as teachers. As currently implemented, when the orientation is done on the first day during the fall semester, candidates become overwhelmed with all of the information they receive as they negotiate being a first-year teacher.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Monitor and Maintain
The Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP Program has met all of its objectives. Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Start Fall Mentorship Earlier

As a part of the MEd mentorship course, university mentors spend an entire day to help induct our new Master’s candidates into the teaching profession. Mentors guide our Master’s candidates in the area of lesson planning, classroom management, assessment, organization, and school politics. The earlier this experience is in the fall the quicker candidates are able to negotiate the learning curve of being a new teacher. We plan to start the mentorship experience the first week students (K-5) report back to the public schools, which is prior to the official start date of GSU classes.

| Established in Cycle: | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------|
| Implementation Status: | Planned |
| Priority: | High |
| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
| Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development |
| Measure: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development |
| Measure: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development |

Implementation Description: Target date is the first week students (K-5) report back to the public schools, which is prior to the official start date of GSU classes.

| Projected Completion Date: | 07/2010 |
|------------------------------------------------|
| Responsible Person/Group: | Program Faculty |
| Additional Resources: | N/A |
| Budget Amount Requested: | $0.00 (no request) |

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP program has made the following changes since last year's assessment report: 1. The faculty member who teaches Critical Theories and Research in Urban Education I and II restructured these courses to allow for more time for the candidates to work on their action research in class. This allows the candidates to reflect on their research with collaboration from their professor and their peers. Feedback from both the faculty member and the candidates reports that this change was helpful for lowering stress and increasing the quality of work by the candidates. 2. 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 coordinated their efforts to prepare Master’s candidates to understand and conduct action research. This collaboration has allowed for a seamless transition between theory (learning about action research) and practice (conducting action research).

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Early Childhood Education MEd GATAPP Program has met all of its objectives. Program faculty will continue to maintain the effective components of the program, assess all outcomes/objectives, and monitor students’ performance on each objective. Additionally, the program faculty has set two Action Plan goals for the 2009-2010 academic year. 1. The program faculty will add a MEd Orientation to the summer semester prior to starting ECE course work in the Master's year of the Program of Study. The orientation will focus on the program schedule and major activities/projects. The major activities/projects include: the mentorship experience and the capstone project. Candidates will also be introduced to the program text (The New Teacher), which will be read across all of their ECE courses. This orientation will allow candidates to grasp the Master's program scope and sequence prior to starting their career as teachers. As currently implemented, when the orientation is done on the first day during the fall semester, candidates become overwhelmed with all of the information they receive as they negotiate being a first-year teacher. 2. As a part of the MEd mentorship course, university mentors spend an entire day to help induct our new Master's candidates into the teaching profession. Mentors guide our Master’s candidates in the area of lesson planning, classroom management, assessment, organization, and school politics. The earlier this experience is in the fall the quicker candidates are able to negotiate the learning curve of being a new teacher. We plan to start the mentorship experience the first week students (K-5) report back to the public schools.
schools, which is prior to the official start date of GSU classes

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Early Childhood Education PhD
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
Pursuing a doctoral degree is more than completing a series of courses; it is a coherent and integrated process designed to develop scholars and leaders in early childhood and elementary education. Congruent with the vision of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the ECE faculty believe that the “primary outcome for the doctoral candidate is to become a leader who influences the practice of early childhood education through the generation of knowledge; the education of early childhood professionals; the conduct of research, the development, implementation and evaluation of curriculum; the administration of early childhood programs and services; and the analysis and generation of public policy” (NAEYC Core Principles for Advanced Degrees, 2003).

**Goals**

**G 1: Overall Goal**
The overall goal is to recruit, retain, and graduate high quality graduates in a learning environment that supports students’ success.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Thoughtful writers and speakers (M: 1, 3)**
Graduate will be thoughtful writers and speakers.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

**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: Active seeker of knowledge (M: 1, 3)**
Active seekers of knowledge remain current on theory and research and are able to critique, synthesize and implement these ideas in their practice.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

**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: Demonstrate research skills (M: 3)**
Graduates will conduct quality, valid, and socially responsible inquiry related to early childhood education.
Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Knowledgeable teachers (M: 2)**
Knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students' thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood education
Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards

**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: Comprehensive examination (O: 1, 2)

The comprehensive exam is used to provide evidence of ECE three outcomes

**Source of Evidence:** Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

### Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers

80% will pass the comprehensive exams on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

For this year, we met our goal. 80% of those taking the comprehensive exams passed on the first attempt. One student needed a second attempt to successfully pass comprehensive exams.

### Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge

80% will pass the comprehensive exams on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

For this year, we met our goal. 80% of those taking the comprehensive exams passed on the first attempt. One student needed a second attempt to successfully pass comprehensive exams.

## M 2: Teaching apprenticeship (O: 4)

The teaching apprenticeship requires students to: 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### Target for O4: Knowledgeable teachers

All students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

Two out of two students successfully completed their university teaching apprenticeship.

## M 3: Dissertation presentation (O: 1, 2, 3)

The student presents a research project including reviewing the literature, analyzing data, and writing a final report for publication.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

### Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers

We will have at least two students to successfully present and defend their dissertation per year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

For 2008-09 we had three students to successfully present and defend their dissertation; all three are minority candidates.

### Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge

We will have at least two students to successfully present and defend their dissertation per year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

For 2008-09 we had three students to successfully present and defend their dissertation; all three are minority candidates.

### Target for O3: Demonstrate research skills

All students will successfully present and defend a quality dissertation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met

Four out of four students successfully presented and defended their dissertation; two fall 08 and 2 sp09.

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

### Comprehensive exams revised

While we met our goal, we have revised our comprehensive exams (based on feedback from earlier years). The first students electing to use the revised comps format will do so summer 2009. It will be required of those entering fall 09. We plan to monitor the process and products associated with the revised comprehensive exams.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Comprehensive examination  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Thoughtful writers and speakers

**Implementation Description:** Beginning summer 2009, continuing...
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Comprehensive exams revised
While we met our goal, we have revised our comprehensive exams (based on feedback from earlier years). The first students electing to use the revised comps format will do so summer 2009. It will be required of those entering fall 09. We plan to monitor the process and products associated with the revised comprehensive exams.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge

Implementation Description: Beginning summer 2009...
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Quality of dissertations
While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge
Responsible Person/Group: PHD Advisory Committee

Summary of Professional Growth
Develop a checklist for mentors to assess students during teaching apprenticeship.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable teachers
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program advisory committee

Summary of research skills form
Develop a checklist of communication and research skills to use in evaluating the presentation of the dissertation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Dissertation presentation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate research skills
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3: What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
We will continue to implement experiences to support doctoral students and evaluate new experiences in progress. Also, we will develop instruments for measuring quality research and communication skills.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We developed four new courses, two specifically focused on developing and supporting students as scholars and writers.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate a successful year. Given that we met our goals, we can continue to refine our practices.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Economics Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

---

**Goals**

G 1: goals

The goals of the Department of Economics’s undergraduate program and its central role in the University core curriculum include teaching students the "economic way of thinking", and helping them appreciate and understand the global economy in which we live today.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Unknown (M: 1)**

Unknown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>2 Recruit, retain &amp; graduate high quality graduates</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: contemporary issues 2 (M: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>2 Recruit, retain &amp; graduate high quality graduates</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 which can be used to assess the new social science learning outcome 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 2010 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. See the attached file to see the actual questions used.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Unknown

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Min of 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Goal 1: Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives. Results: ECON 2100 – The Global Economy (7 sections; 3 instructors; 429 students) 1 % got 0 questions correct 99 % got at least 1 question correct 94 % got at least 2 questions correct 74 % got at least 3 questions correct target met 45 % got at least 4 questions correct 19 % got all 5 questions correct ECON 2105 – Principles of Macroeconomics (5 sections; 3 instructors; 430 students) 1 % got 0 questions correct 99 % got at least 1 question correct 93 % got at least 2 questions correct 78 % got at least 3 questions correct target met 49 % got at least 4 questions correct 19 % got all 5 questions correct ECON 2106 – Principles of Microeconomics (4 sections; 2 instructors; 551 students) 1 % got 0 questions correct 92 % got at least 1 question correct 83 % got at least 2 questions correct 68 % got at least 3 questions correct target not met 49 % got at least 4 questions correct 25 % got all 5 questions correct

Target for O2: contemporary issues 2

Min of 70% of students assessed will get at least 3 out of 5 of the questions correct.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Goal 2: Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions. Results: ECON 2100 – The Global Economy (7 sections; 3 instructors; 429 students) 0 % got 0 questions correct 100 % got at least 1 question correct 98 % got at least 2 questions correct 91 % got at least 3 questions correct target met 71 % got at least 4 questions correct 36 % got all 5 questions correct ECON 2105 – Principles of Macroeconomics (5 sections; 3 instructors; 430 students) 0 % got 0 questions correct 100 % got at least 1 question correct 95 % got at least 2 questions correct 83 % got at least 3 questions correct target met 64 % got at least 4 questions correct 50 % got all 5 questions correct ECON 2106 – Principles of Microeconomics (4 sections; 2 instructors; 551 students) 1 % got 0 questions correct 89 % got at least 1 question correct 76 % got at least 2 questions correct 60 % got at least 3 questions correct target not met 36 % got at least 4 questions correct 11 % got all 5 questions correct

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

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee

discuss with faculty

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

discuss with faculty

The assessment results from core courses will be discussed first with the Department of Economics’s Undergraduate Program Committee, and then with the entire faculty. The UPC will analyze the results and make recommendations to the entire Department and seek additional feedback from the Department.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: First fall meeting of Department of Economics

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Committee

Additional Resources: none

increase number of students assessed

We increased the number of students assessed and the number of instructors involved in assessments this cycle, but we hope to include even more in the future.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We hope to include even more students and instructors in future assessments.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We increased the number of students and instructors involved in assessment.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We seem to continue to do pretty well on both of the contemporary issues general education learning objectives for our courses in the core. The ECON 2106 classes did a little worse this year than last, but that could just be an anomaly. We believe that it makes sense that the ECON 2100 and 2105 classes have better results for these objectives because they more explicitly cover those concepts.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We have not made any program changes. We met all of our general education targets last year and almost met them all this year. The Undergraduate Program Committee did discuss reasons why the ECON 2106 results just missed the target this year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

In general, we are doing pretty well at meeting our targets for the general educational learning objectives. There is some slight concern over the ECON 2106 results this year, but not enough to warrant program changes; we want to see if the trend continues or if it was just something that occurred this year in isolation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will strive for more departmental buy-in. We plan to update the entire faculty each year on our assessment reports and seek their feedback. There is room for improvement as more faculty understand what we are trying to do with assessment of our core courses.
activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.

### Goals

**G 1: goals**
The goals of the Department of Economics's undergraduate program include teaching students the "economic way of thinking", and helping them appreciate and understand the global economy in which we live today. We wish to send out students that are prepared for the competitive job market with skills that are valued by employers.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Economics Basic Theories (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
- 2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Apply to specific fields (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
- 2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Benefits and costs (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Communication (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
- 2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

### 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  
2. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates  
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

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE To measure the success of Economics majors in the undergraduate program in learning core economic concepts, the Department of Economics developed two Tracking Exams (TEs), one for Principles of Microeconomics (MicroTE) and one for Principles of Macroeconomics (MacroTE). Each exam is comprised of 20 multiple choice questions that cover the core concepts taught in the two principles courses. The TEs were previously administered each fall and spring semester in a selection of 3000/4000 level courses. At the end of the 20 questions, the student is asked whether or not they are majoring in Economics, and the student is presented with a list of all undergraduate economics courses and is asked to indicate which courses they have taken. Students are not allowed to take a copy of the exam with them, and are not given the answers to the exam at any point. The two TEs were developed and first administered in Fall 2004. Starting in Fall 2006, the TEs were administered in the newly developed ECON 4999: Senior Capstone Course in Economic Policy. The TEs count for 5% of the final course grade in ECON 4999 (addressing a concern a couple of years ago about students taking the TEs seriously). ECON 4999 is required for all new undergraduate economics majors, effective Fall 2009 (effective Fall 2006, it was required for all undergraduate economics majors except the BA in International Economics and Modern Languages; effective Fall 2009, it is required for all BA IEML majors too). The exam is administered twice - once during the first week of classes and again at the end of the semester - and the higher of the two scores is the one that counts toward the course grade.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The average score for all the students that took the TEs in the 2008-2009 academic year was 73.3% on the MicroTE and 69.3% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 71.3%. 89% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 74% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE.

### Target for O2: Apply to specific fields

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The average score for all the students that took the TEs in the 2008-2009 academic year was 73.3% on the MicroTE and 69.3% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 71.3%. 89% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 74% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE.

### Target for O3: Benefits and costs

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The average score for all the students that took the TEs in the 2008-2009 academic year was 73.3% on the MicroTE and 69.3% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 71.3%. 89% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 74% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE.

### Target for O4: Communication

The average score on each TE should be at least 60%.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The average score for all the students that took the TEs in the 2008-2009 academic year was 73.3% on the MicroTE and 69.3% on the MacroTE, for a combined average score of 71.3%. 89% of students scored at least 60% on the MicroTE and 74% of the students scored at least 60% on the MacroTE.
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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the group project was 91.6%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Apply to specific fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the group project was 91.6%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Benefits and costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the group project was 91.6%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on this assignment should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the group project was 91.6%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: 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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review was 82.9%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Apply to specific fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review was 82.9%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Benefits and costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review was 82.9%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review should be at least 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average grade on the individual book review was 82.9%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 4: 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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade on the student portfolio was 90.2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Apply to specific fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade on the student portfolio was 90.2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Benefits and costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade on the student portfolio was 90.2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average grade on the student portfolio should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade on the student portfolio was 90.2%.

M 5: 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 25% of the course grade) and a second exam after the last module (counting for 25% of the course grade). Class participation and quizzes count for 5% of the course grade.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade was 83.4% on the first exam, 84.1% on the second exam, and 79.8% for quizzes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Apply to specific fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade was 83.4% on the first exam, 84.1% on the second exam, and 79.8% for quizzes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Benefits and costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade was 83.4% on the first exam, 84.1% on the second exam, and 79.8% for quizzes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The average score for each exam and quiz should be at least 75%.

FINDINGS 2008-2009 - TARGET: Met
The average grade was 83.4% on the first exam, 84.1% on the second exam, and 79.8% for quizzes.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Make needed adjustments to ECON 4999

This is the third year that ECON 4999 was offered, and the second year to have substantial enrollment in the course. (Eighty-nine students were enrolled and completed the coursework in the 2008-2009 academic year.) One change we expect is even larger enrollments as the new requirement kicks in for more students. The course is taught jointly by two professors with expertise in either microeconomics or macroeconomics. This may partially explain any discrepancy in results for the MicroTE and MacroTE (tracking exams) in the two sections. For the book review, the instructors agreed that there should be more emphasis on writing it in such a way that it is more of an economics review than a regular book review. This should also aid in avoiding any plagiarism. (There was an obvious case of plagiarism in the first draft in one of the sections, which was caught early and rectified by the student.) One of last year's comments was that instructions for the book review needed to be made clearer to the students, and this was done (although yet more can be done in turning it into a more economics-based assignment). Examples were also given of the student portfolio, which was mentioned last year. Further appropriate adjustments are being made to the assignments and exams to improve the course, especially in light of its official designation as a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course starting Fall 2009.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Exams and Quizzes in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Group Project in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student Portfolio in ECON 4999</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Tracking Examination</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and costs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: end of 2009-2010 academic year
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: ECON 4999 instructors
Additional Resources: none

revise goals, learning objectives, and measures

We believe that our current learning objectives might be better as goals. We want to revise our learning objectives to make them more specific and more easily measurable. We will also consider changing some of the measures to more directly match learning objectives with measures.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: end of 2009-2010 academic year
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Econ dept undergraduate program committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The Undergraduate Program Committee plans to meet several times over the academic year to work on revising our learning objectives and measures. We will seek input from the ECON 4999 instructors as well since the assessments take place in that course. We will likely develop some rubrics for assessment.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We included more students and instructors in our assessments this year. We hope to include even more in the future. We also prepared a summary of our assessments from the past few years and presented it to the full faculty and asked for their input. The Undergraduate Program Committee discussed the findings and the feedback report from UAC last year and have decided to revise our program learning objectives and measures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Upon reflection on the findings we have and the feedback from UAC last cycle, we believe we need to revise our learning objectives and measures to get more meaningful information about whether or not our students are meeting our expectations. We think that the current system we have in place just doesn't capture the right kind of data for us to make meaningful recommendations for program changes. We see assessment as an evolving process, and we need to to make changes to our current system.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have these changes affected your outcome?

The main change we've made is that we've assessed more students. We hope to assess even more students this year. We expect to have better data after we revise our learning objectives and measures as goals. We will seek input from the ECON 4999 instructors as well since the assessments take place in that course.
realize that our old assessments are not giving us the data we need to determine which objectives are really being met.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

We have decided that the current findings are not detailed enough to tell us meaningful information about which learning objectives are being met or not. We don’t think what we have currently is that useful for making operational improvements in our program. The main improvements we expect to make this year are improvements in our learning objectives and measures.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Again, we view assessment as an evolving process and believe it is time for us to step back and review and revise what we have been doing. We anticipate improvement in the quality of data we collect once we overhaul the entire assessment process.

---

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Arts in Economics program is designed to train students for careers in local, state, and federal government and in the private sector. The program emphasizes basic analytical skills, micro- and macro-economic theory, and mathematical statistics, at a level necessary for contributing to and assessing policy research. Microeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8100. Macroeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8110. Statistical skills are taught in Economics 8740 and 8840. Students’ mastery of these skills is assessed with midterm and final examinations in the respective courses. The program also emphasizes advanced understanding of selected topics. Students must take seven additional economics courses, chosen in consultation with their advisors. They must demonstrate mastery of this course material through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers. A final high-quality research paper chosen by the student must demonstrate that the student has the ability to examine an economic problem at a level consistent with advanced graduate course work.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Theoretical and applied background.**
To equip the MA program graduates with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics. Graduates should be able to perform applied economic analysis based on sound theory and data analysis.

**G 2: Professional success and continued education.**
To facilitate the continued academic and professional development of the MA program graduates. Graduates should possess the necessary theoretical and analytic background to perform successfully in the job market and to be able to pursue further graduate level education.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 3: Analytical Skills. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Applying Economic Models. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)**
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

**O/O 2: Economic Disciplines. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

**O/O 4: Economic Data. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Core exams. (O: 2, 3)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 23 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2008-2009. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Application (3.08) and Analytics (3.13) while the highest scores were obtained on Critical Judgment (3.61) and Communication (3.69). There were 20 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2008-2009. A factor analysis revealed relatively high scores on in all areas ranging from about 3.9 to about 4.1. The strongest areas were Applications and Mathematics with about 4.2 each. There were 20 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2008-2009. A factor analysis revealed that the various factors received a score of about 4.1 ranging from Communication skills (3.8) and Math (3.9) to Definitions and Application (4.2 each). Overall, the results show good performance across the various criteria in the three classes. Comparison with last year’s findings show no significant changes in scores.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 23 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2008-2009. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Application (3.08) and Analytics (3.13) while the highest scores were obtained on Critical Judgment (3.61) and Communication (3.69). There were 20 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2008-2009. A factor analysis revealed relatively high scores on in all areas ranging from about 3.9 to about 4.1. The strongest areas were Applications and Mathematics with about 4.2 each. There were 20 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2008-2009. A factor analysis revealed that the various factors received a score of about 4.1 ranging from Communication skills (3.8) and Math (3.9) to Definitions and Application (4.2 each). Overall, the results show good performance across the various criteria in the three classes. Comparison with last year’s findings show no significant changes in scores.

**M 2: Essay. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

An essays was evaluated on several dimensions. For the 14 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 4.23 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.57 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.46 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.71 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.70 for Econometric Skills, 4.64 for Economic Analysis, 4.2 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.5 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. The scores indicate a very strong performance. In fact, this cohort performed substantially better on the essay compared to last year's cohort.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

An essays was evaluated on several dimensions. For the 14 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 4.23 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.57 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.46 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.71 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.70 for Econometric Skills, 4.64 for Economic Analysis, 4.2 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.5 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. The scores indicate a very strong performance. In fact, this cohort performed substantially better on the essay compared to last year's cohort.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

An essays was evaluated on several dimensions. For the 14 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 4.23 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.57 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.46 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.71 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.70 for Econometric Skills, 4.64 for Economic Analysis, 4.2 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.5 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. The scores indicate a very strong performance. In fact, this cohort performed substantially better on the essay compared to last
year’s cohort.

**Target for O4: Economic Data.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

An essay was evaluated on several dimensions. For the 14 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 4.23 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.57 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.46 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.71 for Ability to Convey Research Question(s), 4.70 for Econometric Skills, 4.64 for Economic Analysis, 4.2 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.5 for Data Collection, Measurement, and Computation. For some essays, advisors indicated that the essays could result in publications in some regional journals. The scores indicate a very strong performance. In fact, this cohort performed substantially better on the essay compared to last year’s cohort.

**M 3: Alumni survey. (O: 1)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

We received 1 survey response to this year’s Alumni Survey and 2 responses from graduating students. The alumn listed the content of the core classes in macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics as well as labor economics and the theory of the firm as the most useful material learnt in the program. The alumn was very satisfied with the program, as were the two graduating students. There were positive comments about the comprehensiveness of the program as well as suggestions for closer integration of the MA students into the department by more frequent interactions with faculty.

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

**Alumni**

Compile a database of alumni and reinvigorate the contact with them to track job performance over time and satisfaction with the MA program.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

**Collect timely information**

Execute the newly developed surveys of current and graduating students to track experiences in a timely manner.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

**Exchange programs**

Increase the number of students who participate in international exchange programs by providing comprehensive information and information sessions.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

**High standards in core classes**

Work with the instructors of the core classes to maintain high standards across all measured outcomes, with particular emphasis on providing theoretical content with applied relevance and analytical skills.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

**Improve research essays**

The MA program advisor has received several inquiries from both faculty and students about the essay requirements. We expect an immediate improvement in the quality of research papers from clarifying these guidelines and requiring higher standards for passing.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

**New website**

Build a comprehensive website for the MA program to use in the advising process, program administration, and promotion.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
Professional experience
Increase the number of internships and fellowships available to students to enrich their professional background and preparedness for employment. Also, provide more information about career events and opportunities.

   Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
   Implementation Status: In-Progress
   Priority: High

Recruitment
Compile a large dataset of contacts where we can advertize the program.

   Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
   Implementation Status: Planned
   Priority: High

Recruitment
Increase recruitment efforts in the U.S. and internationally. The new website will be essential in this effort.

   Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
   Implementation Status: In-Progress
   Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
See answers to Administrative Questions 1 and 3 below.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
See answers to Administrative Question 1. In addition, this was the second year when students were required to take two econometrics courses as part of the general requirements of the program. The introduction of a more comprehensive econometrics component has been welcomed by students. As evidenced by the scores on the essays, it has contributed to a marked improvement in the quality of research essays, an important metric of the success of the program. Furthermore, the admissions process has been calibrated to enroll students who have the necessary background to take econometrics classes. Students who do not have the background are required to take math classes as part of the program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings suggest that we need to maintain high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program. We also need to maintain high standards in core microeconomics and macroeconomics classes. Acquired analytical skills and the diverse content of the program produce visible and important results for current students and alumni. See also answers to Administrative Question 3.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The admissions process has taken substantial care to identify gaps in the background of incoming students in terms of macroeconomics, microeconomics, and mathematics. Bringing students up to the level in these areas during the first semester improves their ability to succeed in the program. Therefore, we require students to take additional classes as part of the program. The MA program advisor has worked with incoming students to structure their programs so that they can take full advantages of the wide range of offered courses and can move rapidly through the program without jeopardizing performance. This has been particularly important for the international students who do not have experience with the U.S. education system. The advisor has also been in close communication with applicants and incoming students to explain how they can benefit from the program. We have also streamlined the administrative side of the program making the procedures and requirements transparent and understandable. To improve the professional background of students, we placed several students as research assistants at the policy centers of the Andrew Young School. We are also working on creating a new fellowship for a strong MA student with the International Studies Program. We have created a ULearn page for the MA program where we place information on jobs, internships, and career events. We implemented two new surveys to complement our alumni survey. One of the surveys is administered to the graduating class and inquires about the current job placement, future employment plans, permanent contact information, and plans for continued education. From this survey, we generate a data bank with alumni contacts to be used in alumni surveys. The employment information is used for assessing the success of the program and in recruitment as many potential applicants inquire about the employment opportunities of our graduates. The second survey is anonymous and consists of over 30 questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The survey will be administered to graduating students as well as to current students. The objective is to have timely and comprehensive information about the program. That information is used to make adjustments to the curriculum, administration, and other aspects of the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The assessment is an important tool to gather information from the variety of sources and evaluate our progress with the MA program. The analysis confirms the importance of collecting timely information. The improvements since last year also show that
changes to the program do produce changes in outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The program is well established, and students routinely show strong performance. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. From an administrative point, the main challenge is to have an established plan and a routine for carrying out all the tasks involved in running the program. This allows us to add new components to enrich the experience of students and to streamline even further the logistics of the program. The students benefit most if the program is multifaceted and yet runs in clear and predictable ways. One additional specific improvement is to design explicit criteria for research essays. The MA program advisor has received several inquiries from both faculty and students about these requirements. We should expect an immediate improvement in the quality of research papers from clarifying these guidelines. Two of our students have decided to take advantage of our international exchange program. One student has gone for a semester to China and another to Strasbourg. We will also host three Swiss students from the University of Lausanne. These exchanges add an important dimension to the experiences of students and should be encouraged further. Specifically, we are working on putting together comprehensive information about exchange programs on our new website. This information should serve both our students who are interested in going abroad and international students who want to spend a semester at GSU.

---
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**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge**
To equip the Ph.D. students with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics and to achieve a high level of mastery of the issues, theories, and latest advances in one of the subfields of economics.

**G 2: Research**
To develop a high level of competence in conducting independent and original basic and applied research.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analytical Skills (G: 1)**
To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

**SLO 2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods (G: 1) (M: 3)**
To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics.

**SLO 3: Field Specialization (G: 1) (M: 2, 3)**
To demonstrate mastery of the issues, theories, and latest advances in one of the subfields of economics offered by the program.

**SLO 4: Conducting Independent Research (G: 2) (M: 3, 4, 5)**
To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**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.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O3: Field Specialization**
NA

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The Public Finance field exam was given in June 2008 to 5 students. Four of them passed and one of them failed. The student who failed re-took the exam in January 2009 and passed it. The averages per category were only slightly lower than those for last year’s group. The Labor Economics field exam was offered in June 2008, and all three students that took the exam received a “Low Pass.” The Environmental Economics field exam was also offered in June 2008. Two of three students passed the exam. The student who failed re-took the exam in January 2009 and passed it. The students that passed showed higher averages than those passing last year. The Experimental Economics field exam was given for the first time in June 2008. Two students earned a Pass and three other a Low Pass. No students failed.
### M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 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).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since January 2008, 10 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category were comparable to those of previous years. The average contribution was about 4.1 out of 5, which is quite high. The essay from one dissertation has been already accepted in a highly regarded field journal of regional science. In addition, in 5 cases, the dissertation committee judged that the work would deserve publication in the top journal of the particular field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Field Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since January 2008, 10 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category were comparable to those of previous years. The average contribution was about 4.1 out of 5, which is quite high. The essay from one dissertation has been already accepted in a highly regarded field journal of regional science. In addition, in 5 cases, the dissertation committee judged that the work would deserve publication in the top journal of the particular field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)
Graduates of the Ph.D. 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. This survey will be given at one year and three years after graduation.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three alumni responded to the survey this year. They indicated that the most useful skill gained from the program has been “communicating research findings in writing”, “applied econometrics research skills”, and “econometrics, technical writing, statistical software packages”. They suggested that the program should emphasize more different teaching pedagogies and the use of programming languages. On the scale from 1 to 5, the alumni gave high marks to the program. They would recommend the program to their peers (4.7). The program improved their ability to communicate their ideas in writing and orally (4.0). All three alumni appear to be performing quite successfully. One of them is employed as a partner and managing member in a private company. Two alumni are employed as Assistant Professors at universities and have teaching and research responsibilities. One of them published one book, 4 refereed publications, and more than 20 policy reports since graduation. The other one published 11 papers since graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey (O: 4)
Ph.D. students in their 4th and 5th year will be asked to complete a questionnaire that evaluates the program. The survey will include questions about the students’ current research output, including published and submitted research papers and presentations at the research conferences.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen Ph.D. students in their 4th and 5th year of study responded to the survey. On the scale from 1 to 5, the students gave overall high marks to the program. They would recommend the program to their peers (4.5). The program improved their ability to conduct independent research and use econometric techniques (4.5-4.7), the program improved their ability to communicate their ideas in writing and orally (4.1-4.3), and the program expanded their job opportunities (4.3). Slightly lower scores were obtained on preparation for academic career (4.0). All students reported research activities besides dissertation. Seven students have already published book chapters and articles. Seven articles by four students are published in highly regarded refereed journals such as National Tax Journal, The Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, and Regional Science and Urban Economics. Six students have experience writing policy reports and wrote 36 policy briefs. More importantly, all Ph.D. students have teaching and research responsibilities. One of them published one book, 4 refereed publications, and more than 20 policy reports since graduation. The other one published 11 papers since graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students have written at least one research paper. Eleven students have experience presenting research papers at the conferences, and eight of those students presented the research papers last year in twelve prestigious conferences such as meetings of Eastern Economic Association, Southern Economic Association, and the Society of Labor Economists. Four students taught as instructors at Georgia State University. Because the survey was conducted for the first time, we cannot compare the results with previous years. Overall, from the students’ view the program seems to be on track.

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

**CV writing course**
Organize the CV writing course for Ph.D. students. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**High standards in core classes**
Work with the instructors of the core classes to maintain high standards across all measured outcomes, with particular emphasis on providing theoretical content with applied relevance and analytical skills.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Job market preparation**
Organize the consulting sessions during which faculty will give advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Job market presentation**
Require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag during the Fall semester. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Micro sequence**
Revamp the micro sequence from three semesters to two semesters. This change will eliminate the overlap in material from previous courses. It also will allow students to have their first summer course free so that they can focus solely on comprehensive exams. We expect that this will improve student performance on those exams.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Re-organization of the summer semester I**
Move ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from summer of the second year to spring of the first year. This change will eliminate mandatory courses in summer of the second year. This will allow students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This will also help with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Re-organization of the summer semester II**
By eliminating summer courses in the first year, we will also no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This will allow students to focus on comps only, as opposed to previous when students would try to take additional courses in the summer to save the GPA, only to fail the comps. We expect this change will improve performance of students in comps.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
The department intends to implement several strategies for accomplishing the action plan: 1. Work with the instructors of the core classes to maintain high standards across all measured outcomes, with particular emphasis on providing theoretical content with applied relevance and analytical skills. 2. Revamp the micro sequence from three semesters to two semesters. This change will eliminate the overlap in material from previous courses. It also will allow students to have their first summer course free so that they can focus solely on comprehensive exams. We expect that this will improve student performance on those exams. 3. Move ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from summer of the second year to spring of the first year. This change will eliminate mandatory
courses in summer of the second year. This will allow students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This will also help with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course. 4. By eliminating summer courses in the first year, we will also no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This will allow students to focus on comps only, as opposed to previous when students would try to take additional courses in the summer to save the GPA, only to fail the comps. We expect this change will help with job market outcomes. 5. Organize the consulting sessions during which faculty will give advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes. 6. Organize the surveys is administered to the graduating class and current students and inquires about their publication, research in progress, and GPA. The information will be used for assessing the research and teaching outcomes of students. 7. Require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag during the Fall semester. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department implemented several important changes in the Ph.D. program last year: 1. We identified the procedures to reorganize the micro sequence from three semesters to two semesters. When implemented, this change will eliminate the overlap in material from previous courses. It also will allow students to have their first summer course free so that they can focus solely on comprehensive exams. We expect that this will improve student performance on those exams. 2. Now we require that all Ph.D. students that went through our Masters program to take Ph.D. micro and macro sequence. Previously, they had an option to opt out from the 8100 and 8110 courses and tended to do worse in the comps because of it. We expect this will improve the performance of students in the comps. 3. Now we mandate that all students defend their dissertation proposal one year after the field exam or they will lose funding. This is the first year we did this, and all students passed this new requirement. We hope this makes students start the dissertation earlier and hence finish on time. We expect to see the results of this change in about two years. 4. We merged environmental and urban/regional fields into one field. This change eliminated the “every other year” aspect of both fields as we are now able to offer one course in each field every year. This will move people through the program quicker.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings suggest that we need to maintain high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program. We also need to maintain high standards in core microeconomics and macroeconomics classes. Acquired analytical skills and the diverse content of the program produce visible and important results for current students and alumni. See also answers to Academic Question 3.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

See answers to Academic Question 1 above. In addition, we implemented two new surveys to complement our alumni survey. One of the surveys is administered to the graduating class and current students and inquires about their publication, research in progress, policy reports, participation at the conferences, teaching experience, and other measurable information. The information will be used for assessing the research and teaching outcomes of students. The second survey is anonymous and consists of questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The survey is administered to graduating students as well as to current students. The objective is to have timely and comprehensive information about the program. That information is used to make adjustments to the curriculum, administration, and other aspects of the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The assessment is an important tool to gather information from the variety of sources and evaluate our progress with the Ph.D. program. The improvements since last year also show that changes to the program produce changes in outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

See answers to Academic Question 3 above. The program is well established, and students show strong performance. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. From an administrative point, it is important to have an established plan for carrying out all the tasks involved in running the program. This allows us to add new components to enrich the experience of students and to streamline even further the logistics of the program.
implement, evaluate, and interpret data-based research, (b) prepare and teach courses at a university level which have a theoretical foundation and convey research-based information, (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. There were 36 Ph.D. students in Special Education during the 08-09 year; four of the students were PULSE students, and four were PRIDE students, all eight of whom were funded through grants from the U.S. Department of Education.

**Goals**

**G 1: Develop expertise in research skills**
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to design, implement, evaluate and interpret their own research. In addition, students will be able to write data-based research articles for peer review journals, write grants, and critically read and analyze data-based research.

**G 2: Develop expertise in teaching higher education**
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to teach at the university level, including university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.

**G 3: Engage in professional development**
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will engage in professional development experiences, including collaborating with colleagues at the university and K-12 levels, and with community organizations.

**G 4: Develop content expertise**
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will develop content expertise in special education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Students will design and conduct investigations (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will develop expertise in research skills, specifically the ability to design, implement and evaluate their own research studies. They will also prepare their results for publication and submit their finding to refereed journals. Students will also develop skills in grant writing.

Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section

**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

**SLO 2: Students will teach at the university level (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students will develop expertise in teaching at the university level through teaching (or assisting in teaching) university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.

Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Teaching Section

**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

**SLO 3: Students will participate in presentations (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Students will participate in professional development activities, including presentations and participation in professional organizations.

Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Professional Development

**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

**SLO 4: The student will meet course/program requirements (G: 4) (M: 4)**
The student will demonstrate content expertise by earning satisfactory course grades, participating in class, passing the comprehensive exam, and successful defense of the prospectus (as appropriate).

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
### 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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Students will design and conduct investigations**
By candidacy, 100% of students will have submitted a manuscript in which they were the senior author, to a refereed journal.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Finding: 100% of students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Other evaluation in this area for the 08-09 year include the following: 19 articles were submitted by 16 students (with students being the senior author on 9 of these articles); 11 articles were published by 8 students (with students being the senior author on 3 articles); 4 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 4 students; and 2 grants were prepared with the assistance of 2 students.

#### M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)
Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lectureres, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Students will teach at the university level**
By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Finding: 100% of students who have reached candidacy have assisted or taught at least one university course. Other evaluation in this area for the 08-09 year include the following: 18 student assisted in teaching 51 courses; 16 students taught 36 courses at GTAs; 11 students gave 33 guest lectures; and 10 students supervised practicum students.

#### M 3: Evidence of professional development (O: 3)
Evidence or professional development including presentations and participation in professional organizations as compiled from the professional development section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Students will participate in presentations**
100% of the students will have made at least one conference or workshop presentation by candidacy.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Finding: 100% of doctoral students made at least one conference or workshop presentation by candidacy. Other evaluation in this area of the 08-09 year includes the following: 20 students made 28 national conference presentations; 13 students made 15 state conference presentations; 9 students made 42 workshops presentations; and 3 students held offices in professional organizations.

#### M 4: Successful rating on annual evaluation (O: 4)
The student will demonstrate content expertise through successful rating on annual evaluation consisting of a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exam scores, and prospectus (as appropriate).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O4: The student will meet course/program requirements**
Rate a satisfactory or higher on annual evaluations which includes a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exams, and prospectus (as appropriate) (and is determined by the PMA faculty).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Finding: In 2008-09, there were a total of 36 doctoral students: of these 33 were evaluated in spring 09 (three had graduated) and 30 students demonstrated expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in special education. A remediation plan was developed for 3 students. Eight of the students had full funding through federally funded doctoral leadership grants. Three students graduated in 08-09.

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

#### Exit interviews need further standardization
Although progress has been made towards standardization of the exit interview process, exit interview questions need to be further delineated.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Successful rating on annual evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** The student will meet course/program requirements

**Implementation Description:** Implementation will begin in Fall 2009 and be completed by May 2010.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** PMA committee

---

**Goal/objective has been met**

Goal/objective has been met this year with no further action planned.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Evidence of teaching college courses | **Outcome/Objective:** Students will teach at the university level

---

**Goal/Objective has been met**

Goal/Objective has been met this year with no further action needed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Doctoral Indicator Survey—Research section | **Outcome/Objective:** Students will design and conduct investigations

---

**Goal/objective has been met this year**

Goal/objective has been met this year and no further action is needed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Evidence of professional development | **Outcome/Objective:** Students will participate in presentations

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Although the exit interview process has made gains and is going smoothly, further examination is needed regarding the exit interview questions. The PMA committee will discuss this in the fall and changes will be made based on this discussion.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

More attention is being given to the exit interviews. Faculty are conducting the interviews of the students who are graduating and a mechanism is in place to track graduates employment and progress after graduation from GSU.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on the results of this year’s report, the Ph.D. program is on track with students meeting the goals and objectives. The results of this report are reviewed again in the beginning of fall semester to determine if the Doctoral Indicator Survey needs any further information added to its database or if any further goals and objectives are needed.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Educational Leadership EdS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 prepare our students to demonstrate critical/intellectual capacity and moral vision so they can create and sustain democratic communities within their schools and districts. We hope 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.

The mission of the educational leadership program mutually reinforces the framework of the university’s Professional Education Council. The manner in which the program has operationalized its mission through its program revisions supports the aim of “providing scholarship and leadership focused on learning and development.” Further the program has articulated a more explicit normative grounding in democratic principles in order to make a difference not only in the manner in which future school leaders do their jobs, but also in a manner in which that work will significantly impact the quality of life for Georgia citizens.

### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: Stewardship of a vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2: School culture and instructional program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 3: Management of the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: Collaboration with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An educational leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interest and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 5: Integrity, fairness, and ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 6: Legal and ethical considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Professional Development (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop a professional development plan that addresses the needs that were determined from the collection and analysis of relevant data and evidence. The plan will be reflective of input from stakeholders who will participate in the professional development and will be consistent with effective adult learning strategies and effective professional development. (EPEL 8420).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Analysis of significant educational problem (G: 1, 3) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will provide a description and analysis of a significant educational problem that is present in their school or districts. They will apply appropriate methods and theories to ameliorate the problem based on collaborating with administrators, teachers, and other appropriate stakeholders in order to create an action plan that directly addresses the problem including the organizational and personnel supports that are needed to make the plan succeed. (EPEL 8000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Legal and ethical considerations (G: 6) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Equity audit (G: 4, 5) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will initiate and facilitate an equity audit using key stakeholders with their school or districts in order to determine the school's or district's status regarding diversity (i.e. whether the school or district is a monolithic, diverse, or multicultural organization). (EPEL 8020).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Curriculum reform model (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each student will work with a group of teachers and parents within the school or district to evaluate a school reform model or curriculum package based on principles of curriculum theory and design. Based on the analysis, the student and his or her team of stakeholders will determine the appropriateness of the model or package for the district, the resources needed for successful implementation, potential modifications for the sake of consistency with district/school mission and the needs of the particular population, and a consistent means for ongoing monitoring of the package or reform. (EPSF 8440).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Instructional Leadership (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will identify a teacher and provide instructional supervision and support that teacher that teacher. The support and supervision will include a self assessment for the supervised teacher, classroom observations, periodic conferences, review of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Professional Development (O: 1)

Students will develop a professional development plan that addresses the needs that were determined from the collection and analysis of relevant data and evidence. The plan will be reflective of input from stakeholders who will participate in the professional development and will be consistent with effective adult learning strategies and effective professional development. (EPEL 8420).

**Target for O1: Professional Development**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the professional development rubric (EPEL 8420).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.

#### M 2: Significant educational problem (O: 2)

Students will provide a description and analysis of a significant educational problem that is present in their school or districts. They will apply appropriate methods and theories to ameliorate the problem based on collaborating with administrators, teachers, and other appropriate stakeholders in order to create an action plan that directly addresses the problem including the organizational and personnel supports that are needed to make the plan succeed. (EPEL 8000).

**Target for O2: Analysis of significant educational problem**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the significant educational problem rubric (EPEL 8000).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.

#### M 3: Legal and ethical considerations (O: 3)

Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330). For legal and ethical considerations, the following rubric is used:

**LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations**

- Highly effective selection and use of resources regarding legal issue; thoughtful consideration of differing views regarding the issue; high degree of justification regarding the analysis of the legal issue and the conclusions drawn; very clear representation of information and ideas; thorough identification of laws applicable to the legal topic.

**Meets Expectations**

- Effective selection use of resources regarding legal issue; consideration of differing views regarding the issue; adequate justification regarding the analysis of the legal issue and the conclusions drawn; clear representation of information and ideas; adequate identification of laws applicable to the legal topic.

**Does Not Meet Expectations**

- Little or no consideration of differing views or misguided representation of one view; regarding the issue; little to no justification regarding the analysis of the legal issue; little to no conclusions drawn or conclusions undetermined; little or no identification of laws applicable to the legal topic.

**Target for O3: Legal and ethical considerations**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the legal and ethical considerations rubric (EPEL 8330).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.
M 4: Equity audit (O: 4)

Students will initiate and facilitate an equity audit using key stakeholders with their school or districts in order to determine the school's or district's status regarding diversity (i.e. whether the school or district is a monolithic, diverse, or multicultural organization). Students will help school and/or district stakeholders identify diversity issues related to school policies, curriculum, instruction, culture, management, and operations, personnel, and parent involvement and then apply those issues toward the audit. EQUITY AUDIT RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Student presents a thorough, holistic report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student is able to help stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Meets Expectations: Student submits an acceptable report of multiple diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving significant stakeholders. Student achieves moderate success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization. Does Not Meet Expectations: Student submits a report that omits significant diversity issues related to his/her school or district based on an equity audit involving a subset of significant stakeholders. Student achieves little success in helping stakeholders who were involved on the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

EQUITY AUDIT RUBRIC:

- Target:
- Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Over 90% of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the equity rubric (EPFL 8020).

M 5: Curriculum reform model (O: 5)

Each student will work with a group of teachers and parents within the school or district to evaluate a school reform model or curriculum package based on principles of curriculum theory and design. Based on the analysis, the student and his or her team of stakeholders will determine the appropriateness of the model or package for the district, the resources needed for successful implementation, potential modifications for the sake of consistency with district/school mission and the needs of the particular population, and district based means for ongoing monitoring of the package or reform. CURRICULUM REFORM MODEL RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Student meets all indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides a thorough, thoughtful, well-documented analysis with highly significant recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that clearly and effectively communicates analysis and recommendations. Meets Expectations: Student meets at least 80% of the indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides a thorough, thoughtful, well-documented analysis with significant recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that adequately communicates analysis and recommendations. Does Not Meet Expectations: Student meets less than 80% of the indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides an inadequate, poorly documented analysis with few or no recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that does not adequately communicate analysis and recommendations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

CURRICULUM REFORM MODEL RUBRIC:

- Target:
- Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Over 90% of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the curriculum reform model rubric (EPSF 8440).

M 6: Instructional leadership (O: 6)

Students will identify a teacher and provide instructional supervision and support that teacher that teacher. The support and supervision with include a self assessment for the supervised teacher, classroom observations, periodic conferences, review of lesson plans, examination of student work, review of test scores assessment of class policies, plus other relevant data and information. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Highly thoughtful and coherent selection of supervision instruments to address specific needs of each teacher/support staff member; highly responsive to needs of teachers/support staff throughout supervision process. Use instruments with high degree of integrity, thoughtfully integrate findings from various sources of data regarding teacher/support staff performances. Create supportive rapport with teachers; demonstrate highly responsive and sensitive support to teachers/support staff throughout process; help teachers/support staff improve in the self assessment of their work. Astute analysis of teacher/support staff strengths and possible areas for improvement and/or enrichment; meaningful recommendations for teacher/support staff; very thoughtful conclusions regarding the role of the school/district leader as a supervisor with meaningful conclusions regarding future supervisory work. Meets Expectations: Thoughtful and coherent selection of supervision instruments to address specific needs of each teacher/support staff member; somewhat responsive to needs of teachers/support staff throughout the supervision process. Use instruments with moderate integrity, some integration of findings from various sources of data regarding teacher/support staff performances. Create positive rapport with teachers/support staff; demonstrate some degree of responsiveness and sensitivity in supporting teachers/support staff throughout process; some attempt made to help teachers/support staff improve in the self assessment of their work. Adequate analysis of teacher/support staff strengths and possible areas for improvement and/or enrichment; adequate recommendations for teacher/support staff; and somewhat thoughtful conclusions regarding future supervisory work. Does Not Meet Expectations: Little or no thought or coherence regarding the selection of supervision instruments; failure to address specific needs of teacher/support staff member throughout the supervision process; little or no integrity in the use of supervision instruments; poor or no analysis of findings. Create a negative relationship with teachers/support staff; fail to demonstrate responsiveness and sensitivity to the needs of teachers/support staff throughout process; fail to help teachers/support staff improve in the self assessment of their work. Poor to no analysis of teacher/support staff strengths and possible areas for improvement and/or enrichment; poor or no recommendations for teacher/support staff; poor or no conclusions regarding future supervisory work.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
**Target for O6: Instructional Leadership**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the instructional leadership rubric (EPEL 8420).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Over 90% of the students exceeded or met expectations for this achievement target.

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

#### Extending program by one semester

Since this is the first year with the new program, we have talked with the students about the things they thought were very good about the new program and things they would recommend that we change. Based on their feedback related to the intensity of the program, we are planning to extend the program by one semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Educational Leadership Unit
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Revision of coaching model

Since this is the first year with the new program, we have talked with the students about the things they thought were very good about the new program and things they would recommend that we change. Based on their feedback we are also in the process of revising our coaching process and our portfolio format. Coaching and the portfolio are components that are required by the state.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Educational Leadership Unit
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

See response for Academic Question 2.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Analysis of the long standing, previous EdS program was suspended last year due to the required major changes for the new EdS (PL-6) certification. The EdS Leadership Program has undergone a complete program redesign based on the state's new standards and requirements for certification. We are still working with the first cohort of students and they have not yet completed the program. Our evaluation that is included in this report reflects the measures that have been assessed through the courses that have been taken by the cohort of students. The assessments indicate that the program is strong regarding outcomes and objectives. We met or exceeded the targets we established. The measurements were based on the course rubrics and the observations of the students in their performance based activities. 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. Since this is the first year with the new program, we have talked with the students about the things they thought were very good about the new program and things they would recommend that we change. Based on their feedback related to the intensity of the program, we are planning to extend the program by one semester. We are also in the process of revising our coaching process and our portfolio format. Coaching and the portfolio are components that are required by the state.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

As previously stated, since this is the first year with the new program, we have talked with the students about the things they thought were very good about the new program and things they would recommend that we change. Based on their feedback related to the intensity of the program, we are planning to extend the program by one semester. We are also in the process of revising our coaching process and our portfolio format. Coaching and the portfolio are components that are required by the state.
Goals

G 1: Goals 1-4
1. Can apply leadership theory in practice 2. Can design and implement action research 3. Can perform as change agent in schools
4. Can lead in urban education settings

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Outcomes/Objectives 1-4 (M. 1, 2)

Student is able to apply general theories of leadership to practice Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/30/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 2. 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. 3. Students who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 4. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. 5. Students 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. 6. 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. 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. 8. Students 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. 9. 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. 10. 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. 11. 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.

Institutional Priorities 1.11 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline 2.21 Applied focus based upon a foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students 2: Can design and implement action research (Final) Student can apply the tools of action research to improve school performance Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 2. 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. 3. Students who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 4. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. 5. Students 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. 6. 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. 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. 8. Students 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. 9. 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. 10. 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. 11. 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.

3: Can perform as change agent in schools (Final) Student effectively performs as a change agent by positively impacting the culture of the school Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 2. 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. 3. Students who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 4. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. 5. Students 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. 6. 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. 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. 8. Students 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. 9. 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. 10. 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. 11. 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: Can lead in urban education settings

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 3: Can perform as change agent in schools (Final) Student effectively performs as a change agent by positively impacting the culture of the school Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 2. 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. 3. Students who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 4. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. 5. Students 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. 6. 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. 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. 8. Students 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. 9. 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. 10. 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. 11. 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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluations in Key Courses (O: 1)


M 2: STARS Survey (O: 1)

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 candidate professional dispositions. Professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to effectively lead an urban school. Students and faculty complete the survey at the end of the program. Source of Evidence: Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 10/01/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Edit Measure Achievement Targets and Assessment Results / Findings: 4: Can provide leadership for urban education Achievement Target (Final) Faculty rate 89% of students At or Above the Expected level of "4 - Proficient" at program completion across all standards. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Edit Achievement Target Findings: 2007-2008 Assessment Results / Findings Target: Met Standard 1: 86% Standard 2: 85% Standard 3: 76% Standard 4: 85% Standard 5: 94% Average 85% Established by Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Edit Finding Add Action Plan 2006-2007 Assessment Results / Findings Target: Met Standard 1: 84% Standard 2: 86% Standard 3: 72% Standard 4: 83% Standard 5: 94% Standard 6: 87% Total: 84% Established by Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 2005-2006 Assessment Results / Findings Target: Partially Met STANDARD 1 (Met): 89% At Expected. STANDARD 2 (Met): 89% At Expected. STANDARD 3 (Not Met): 67% At Expected. STANDARD 4 (Met): 78% At Expected. Standard 5 (Met): 96% At Expected. STANDARD 6 (Met): 82% At Expected. ACROSS ALL STANDARDS (Met): 84% At Expected. Established by Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) Can provide leadership for urban education 2005-2006 Leadership for urban education 2006-2007 change agents in schools 2007-2008 Source of Evidence: Existing data

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

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. Thein-school performances have been shifted to the courses to allow for more attention in the practicum courses on data analysis and action research.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009 Implementation Status: In-Progress Priority: High
Change Agent 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 an emphasis on issues of diversity in schools and communities.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

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, and the students in the program concur.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
In an effort to further our collaborative efforts, our unit is meeting on a more regular basis. As a part of these meetings, we are looking at ways to further align our curricular delivery in the M.Ed. and other programs. Further, we have begun the process of informally surveying students with regard to what they feel is valuable in our programs and what they feel could use improvement. Finally, in working with school system personnel, we engage in regular conversations about how to improve our delivery methods. These surveys and conversations in combination with our own ideas about how to improve are being used as we strive for continuous improvement.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The leadership program has changed dramatically since last year’s assessment. Specifically, the program has decreased considerably in size due to the changes to the PSC’s certification structure, and the program’s school-based experiences have been embedded into the classes rather than been carried out in an individual class. While this change has presented some challenges, the unit is of the belief that this change will provide a stronger, more seamless structure for the M.Ed. students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The most telling information we have gained from our assessments is that students are pleased with their site-based experiences and would like to have more of them. In reaction to this, our unit is looking at ways to give students in the M.Ed. and other programs extended experiences in other school systems (specifically in the Chicago area public schools among others) in an effort to both strengthen and broaden this experience.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Our unit has embedded the internship experiences into the course content and has changed the practicum to be a two-part seminar in action research and data analysis. We feel that these changes have helped our students to have stronger linkages between their coursework and their performances and that the seminar has given them a stronger understanding of how research impacts their schools.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
The findings of this year’s assessment help us to better understand what we are doing well and what we need to improve. This information is helpful because it gives us information on how to better serve our students and schools.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Some of our strategies have been outlined previously in this report. However, to reiterate, we will continue to meet on a more regular basis as a unit and will also continue to listen to our students and the school system personnel we serve. By using these elements in addition to the other data in this report, we hope to continue our trend of continuous improvement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Educational Policy Studies PhD
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Educational Policy Studies offers a Ph.D. degree in Educational Policy Studies with concentrations in educational leadership, social foundations of education, and research, measurement, and statistics. The program allows students to examine the philosophy and practice of education and to develop skills in both the methodology and the study of educational practice. Students will prepare to become policy makers and examiners of policy and the effects of policy on education. The broader requirements of the Department of Educational Policy Studies offer students the opportunity to linked their programs of study with broader social and educational issues in such areas as race, gender, leadership, and policy. This broader context established an understanding of the programs of study as essential components rather than separate structures of our social, economic, and political lives.

Goals
G 1: Critically Evaluates Literature
This goal is important for the department to evaluate whether our doctoral students have demonstrated the ability to critique, summarize, and interpret the findings from published research and scholarship.

G 2: Interprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts
The purpose of this goal is to evaluate whether our doctoral students have demonstrated a knowledge base of theories on how to analyze educational issues about race, class and gender.

G 3: Conducts Scholarly Research
The purpose of this goal is to evaluate whether doctoral students have demonstrated the ability to design and execute a major research study in their program.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Students will examine policymaking power (G: 1) (M: 1)
Although student learning comes from a number of classes, we are using just one of the doctoral cohort classes--EPS 9270--for measuring the assessment. The policy paper must examine a key characteristic of policymaking: power. There are, as we will examine in the readings on policy, a number of ways to examine policy. To some degree there are two sets of policy studies, one focused on how to make the system work better and one focused on how deeply flawed the system is. Yet underneath both sets, and sometimes brought to the forefront of policy discussions, is an important question: What is power?

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Students will prepare a cultural studies analysis (G: 2) (M: 2)
A critique and analysis of the readings in light of the ways cultural meanings of race, class and gender are represented in education via media. Each student will be asked to carefully observe print media and television/movies (of your choosing)—in order to interpret the class readings and conceptual treatments among the courses themes: Critical Race Theory, White Privilege, Youth Subcultures, (Post) Colonialism & Globalization, Masculinities & Feminities, Sexualities, and Social Class Differences.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Students will write high quality dissertations (G: 3) (M: 3)
We plan to discuss an assessment to measure the quality of dissertations that will guide students and faculty committee members as they work together to develop high quality dissertations.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Power Analysis (O: 1)**

The paper of at least ten pages, with at least ten scholarly or research references, addressing the following questions: what is power?, who exercises it in United States educational policy?, and how do they exercise it? You may use as references the required and recommended readings for this course, but you will also need to use at least six other references, and they must be research or scholarly references. The instructor uses an Analytical Rating Guide rubric (see Document Repository).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Students will examine policymaking power**

95% of students will obtain a score of 2 or better as evaluated by program faculty for this activity.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

9 students met or exceeded the outcomes.

**M 2: Cultural Studies Analysis (O: 2)**

For purposes of evaluation, the student will prepare a paper, 5-7 pages consisting of the following 3 parts: (Part A) identification and discussion of media images chosen; (Part B) theoretical analysis of Part A using textual readings for supporting evidence; (Part C) concluding remarks or summary statements on the potential media bias and/or impact of popular cultural consumption. The paper will be evaluated using the following rubric: 3=exceeded outcomes. Comprehensive, insightful, creative, inquisitive, demonstrates conceptual clarity, integrates reading, terms, concepts, and shows syntactical accuracy. 2=met outcomes. Generally clear, somewhat connected to reading, terms, concepts, some instances of syntactical errors (e.g., passive voice, excessive pronouns,) loose analysis, tentative conclusions. 1=did not meet outcomes. Fragmented, indifferent, unimaginative, lacks clarity, superficial and weak.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Students will prepare a cultural studies analysis**

95% of students will obtain a score of 2 or better as evaluated by program faculty for this activity.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

9 students met or exceeded the outcomes in the assignment.

**M 3: Dissertation Scoring Assessment (O: 3)**

The activity and scoring assessment of dissertations is under discussion among the faculty at this time.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O3: Students will write high quality dissertations**

95% of students successfully passed their dissertation defenses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

16 students successfully defended their dissertations during the period under assessment.

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

**review of cohort courses**

Continual review and improvement to the two first-year doctoral cohort courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Cultural Studies Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students will prepare a cultural studies analysis
- Measure: Power Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students will examine policymaking power

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Academic Affairs Committee

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will be engaged in a two-day retreat to discuss possible revisions of the doctoral program, redesigned capstone course, and dissertation quality scoring.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We've identified course-based assignments aligned with learning outcomes that are evaluated on scoring rubrics.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment findings indicate the strength of continuing a two-course, one-year required doctoral cohort core.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Educational Psychology MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 master 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 currently 35 students (including one concurrent student) in the MS program and 7 students graduated during this report period.

**Goals**

G 1: Displays expertise with major concepts
   Displays expertise with major concepts

G 2: Participates in scholarly activities
   Participates in scholarly activities

G 3: Values underpinning educational psychology
   Values underpinning educational psychology

G 4: Apply research methods
   Apply research methods

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Students demonstrate expertise in Ed. Psych. (G: 1) (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

SLO 2: Students demonstrate independence and competence (G: 2) (M: 2)

Students demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Masters Comprehensive Exam (O: 1)
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.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Students demonstrate expertise in Ed. Psych.**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comps.

**Findings 2008-2009** - **Target: Met**
all students passed the exam.

#### M 2: Thesis or Project (O: 2)
Each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must complete a thesis research study or a comprehensive literature review 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Students demonstrate independence and competence**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of their comprehensive exams

**Findings 2008-2009** - **Target: Met**
all students passed the exam.

#### M 3: Portraying values of Ed. Psych. (O: 3)
As part of the comprehensive exam, each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must either complete an empirical study which shows evidence of the ability to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, and act ethically; or must complete a scholarly literature review which shows evidence of the ability to weigh evidence and tolerate ambiguity inherent in many research studies.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O3: Students demonstrate values underpinning ed. psych**
All students will pass the oral and written portions of their comprehensive exams

**Findings 2008-2009** - **Target: Met**
all students passed the exam.

#### M 4: Research Design and Statistics (O: 4)
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target for O4: Understand and apply research methods**

All students must successfully complete assigned coursework in research design prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

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

#### Orientation for Spring Acceptances

A special orientation will be conducted for students accepted in the spring (this way they do not need to wait until the fall to attend an orientation).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing action plan
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and EPY faculty

#### Review of program

Faculty will review the program to determine if changes need to be made.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This plan will be implemented throughout the year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

#### Tracking of Applicants

Applicants’ demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) will be tracked for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing action
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Faculty will volunteer to conduct the spring orientation. The coordinator will collect the applicants’ demographic information and share with the faculty. Program Coordinator will meet with faculty to discuss review of the Master’s Program and decide which aspects need to be changed/improved.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We conducted our first spring orientation for students newly accepted in the spring. We also began tracking the applicants’ demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We will continue to conduct spring orientations and collect data on our applicants. From the data collected, we may be able to notice trends and patterns characteristic of students that we accepted and those that we rejected.
Goals

G 1: Demonstrates values of Educational Psychology
Demonstrates values underpinning Educational Psychology

G 5: Develop competence in college teaching
Develop competence in college teaching

G 6: Participates in scholarly activities
Participates in scholarly activities

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 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

SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (M: 1, 2, 3, 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

SLO 3: Understand and apply research methods (M: 1, 2, 3, 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

SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects (M: 1, 2, 3, 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

SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 5) (M: 1, 4)
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

SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 6) (M: 1, 2, 3, 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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Annual review (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.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### Target for O3: Understand and apply research methods
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### Target for O5: Develop competence in college teaching
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### Target for O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities
All students will be given a rating of "satisfactory" in their annual review.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except one received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

### M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
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.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

### Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

### Target for O3: Understand and apply research methods
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

### Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

Target for O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities
All students will successfully complete the professional development seminar.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students who enrolled in EPY 8961 successfully completed the seminar.

M 3: Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)
All students must defend a dissertation based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology
All students successfully defend their dissertation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted defended their dissertation, successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing
All students successfully defend their dissertation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted defended their dissertation, successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O3: Understand and apply research methods
All students successfully defend their dissertation proposal.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted defended their dissertation, successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects
All students successfully defend their dissertation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted defended their dissertation, successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities
All students successfully defend their dissertation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted defended their dissertation, successfully completed the requirements.

M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O3: Understand and apply research methods
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.
Target for **O4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects**
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

Target for **O5: Develop competence in college teaching**
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

Target for **O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities**
All students will successfully complete their teaching internship as judged by the supervision instructor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
all students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

**M 5: Presentations and Publications (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)**
All students in EPY are expected to present papers at professional organizations and publish in professional journals.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Can reflect values of Educational Psychology**
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 37 presentations, publications and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

**Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing**
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 37 presentations, publications and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

**Target for O3: Understand and apply research methods**
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 37 presentations, publications and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects**
Each student will show evidence of presentations at meetings of professional organizations, publication in professional journals and preparation of grant proposals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 37 presentations, publications and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

**Target for O6: Demonstrate competence 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 37 presentations, publications and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

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

**Application Deadline and Requirements**
The application deadline will change from March 1 to January 15 and at least two academic letters of recommendation will be required (it the past, "academic" was not specified).
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The changes have gone into effect for the 2010 application cycle.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator

**EPY 9660**
The teaching residency will become an official course, called EPY 9660: Internship in Educational Psychology.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The course became available in August of 2009.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator

**Program Changes**
Faculty will review student survey and plan and implement program changes based on the survey results.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This is an ongoing plan
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and EPY faculty

**Remedial Plan**
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Annual review
- **Outcome/Objective:** Develop competence in college teaching

Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Remedial Plan
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Annual review
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities

Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Remediation Plan
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Annual review
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can reflect values of Educational Psychology

Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Remediation Plan
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Annual review
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understand and apply research methods

Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Remediation Plan
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Annual review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate expertise with major aspects

Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Student Representation
Two students will be nominated (by the other students) to attend part of EPY program programs to share student perspectives on program issues.

Survey Students
Students will be surveyed on their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Tracking of Applicants
Applicants’ demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) will be tracked for the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Frequent monthly meetings with student representation will help us accomplish our action plan. We will continue to monitor applicant demographics for any kinds of patterns.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
- Two students were nominated (by the other students) to attend part of EPY program programs to share student perspectives on program issues. They will begin attending part of the Program meetings in September 2010.
- Applicants’ demographics (such as race, gender, age, GPA/GRE scores) were tracked for the first time in the following categories: Accepted and Enrolled, Accepted and Did Not Enroll, Rejected.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

By inviting student representatives to our Program meetings, we hope to include greater student voice in many program decisions (as appropriate). The survey results has helped and will continue to help frame needed changes to our program. Tracking of applicants’ demographics will help us to determine if there are any patterns of acceptance/rejections that we need to be attentive to.
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.

Goals
G 1: Prepare students for education at the doctoral level
Students who graduate with an Educational Research M.S. should be prepared to continue on into a Ph.D. program if they choose to pursue a doctoral degree, whether that degree program is in an applied area or in research methodology. While not all students have such ambitions, their training in our master's program should prepare them and qualify them for that.

G 2: Provide training relevent to research-related jobs
By the time students graduate with an Educational Research M.S., they should have qualifications that will improve their vocational options, either by enhancing the credentials they already had or by providing them with credentials that will make them eligible for new job opportunities in which conducting research, analyzing data, and/or reporting results are a major component of the job duties.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 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.

Institutional Priority Associations
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

SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6)
Be able to write a review of an article found in a professional journal.

Institutional Priority Associations
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

SLO 3: Design a research study (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 5, 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
1.14 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

SLO 4: Analyze data and report the results (G: 1, 2) (M: 4, 5, 6)
Be able: 1. to recognize an appropriate technique for analyzing data, given the research query and the design used to collect the data 2. to conduct the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data 3. to interpret and to report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data

Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 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 literature review (O: 1, 2)
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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All literature reviews this year came from course assignments, and all students’ literature reviews met or exceeded the standard both for forming a research question and for critiquing the literature.

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All literature reviews this year came from course assignments, and all students’ literature reviews met or exceeded the standard both for forming a research question and for critiquing the literature.

M 2: Course assessment: Article review (O: 2)
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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All article reviews exceeded the standard of performance regarding critiquing a published journal article.

M 3: Course assessment: Write a Method section (O: 3)
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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Design a research study**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All Method sections met or exceeded the standard of performance for designing a research study.

M 4: Course assessment: Write a Results section (O: 4)
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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Not all students met or exceeded the standard of performance for analyzing data and reporting on the results of the analysis.

M 5: 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.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

No students completed a master’s project or master's thesis in 2008.
**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students completed a master's project or master's thesis in 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Design a research study**

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students completed a master's project or master's thesis in 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students completed a master's project or master's thesis in 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various homework assignments, quizzes, and exams also assessed one or more of the learning outcomes. All students met or exceeded the standard of performance on all portions of the assessments that pertained to a learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various homework assignments, quizzes, and exams also assessed one or more of the learning outcomes. All students met or exceeded the standard of performance on all portions of the assessments that pertained to a learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Design a research study**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various homework assignments, quizzes, and exams also assessed one or more of the learning outcomes. All students met or exceeded the standard of performance on all portions of the assessments that pertained to a learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings  2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various homework assignments, quizzes, and exams also assessed one or more of the learning outcomes. All students met or exceeded the standard of performance on all portions of the assessments that pertained to a learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Incorporate LOA-relevant assessments into courses**

Although several of our doctoral courses have one or more of the assessments for evaluating students on the learning objectives, these assessments are scarce in our master’s level courses. We will incorporate them into our master’s courses for 2006-2007 and update the report when we have data.

- Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Some already in FA06, more to come in SP06
- Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: RMS Faculty

**Put more emphasis on analysis & reporting results**

Our students need to have superior skills at analyzing data and reporting on the results of those analyses. Expectations at the master’s level are not quite as high as at the doctoral level, but we still have high standards for our master’s students in this area, and those standards were not met by all students this year. We will therefore provide more emphasis on instruction on the analysis of
data, the interpretation of the results, and the communication of both the results and the interpretation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Course assessment: Write a Results section  
**Outcome/Objective:** Analyze data and report the results  

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** RMS Faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will provide more in-class instruction on data analysis and reporting results. We will continue to provide feedback on all assessments that pertain to analysis/reporting in order that even if students did not meet the standard on a given assessment, they might learn from the feedback and be more successful the next time they conduct an analysis and/or write a report of the results.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

A problem from the previous 2 years had been having very little data on the learning outcomes for our master’s students. For 2008, we had more data on our master’s students than the previous 2 years combined, so we are showing signs of improvement regarding that.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We need to address Objective 4. If our own students are not performing at the highest levels on this objective, then it is reasonable to assume that students in other programs are not performing at the highest levels, so we need to improve our course instruction on the analysis of data and the communication of the results.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 English Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The core courses in the English Department are committed to providing the highest level of instruction for our students. We seek to develop students’ critical thinking, reading, and especially writing skills through engaging them in meaningful analysis of literary, cultural, and other readings; understanding the social and discourse communities that shape writing; and writing as responsible, purposeful social action.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Unknown (M: 1)**

Unknown

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
Mission / Purpose
Description: 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. When the English Department began to work on assessment in 2004, it established a list of twenty-two learning outcomes that emerged from the four concentrations in Literature, Creative Writing, Secondary English, and Rhetoric and Composition (see the list of undergraduate learning outcomes in the repository). We used these outcomes as our guiding document when creating the criteria that we employ for the eight assessment tools used in the undergraduate program. While we will continue to use the same criteria for assessment, we have decided that starting with the 2008-2009 assessment report, we will focus only on three outcomes in our assessment analysis: knowledge of the use of language; ability to interpret texts; and effective communication.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of the use of language
Students will develop an understanding of the language (the relation between words and ideas, the nuances of expression, the effects of particular language choices, etc.).

G 2: Effective written communications
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

G 3: Ability to interpret texts
Students will develop the skills of critical thinking and interpretation so that they can understand multiple levels of meaning when responding to texts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Findings 2008-2009 - 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 5.5 out of a possible 6; Medium = a total score of 4.1 out of a possible 6; Low = a total score of 3.3 out of a possible score of 6. The total score across all rubrics including high, medium and low essays = a total score of 4.3. 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 4.6 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 1.5-2.0 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 5.5 for the high group, a 4.5 for the medium group and a 3.5 for the low group. We will reexamine our assessment rubric for next year. DISCLAIMER: THE EVALUATION SCALE USED THIS YEAR IS DIFFERENT FROM THE ONE USED LAST YEAR, WHICH EXPLAINS THE DIFFERENCES IN FIGURES BETWEEN THE TWO YEARS. IN OTHER WORDS, THESE RESULTS ARE INCOMPARABLE.

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
Implementation Description: Spring, 2009
Responsible Person/Group: Angela Hall-Godsey, LDS program
### SLO 1: Knowledge of language and linguistics (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well as an understanding of some of the structures and functions of language.

**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
- 1.13 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: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

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**
- 1.11 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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 3: Ability to produce effective written communication (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Students will be able to apply knowledge of the elements of rhetoric for effective communications in writing; to write for 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**
- 1.11 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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Senior Exit Portfolio - Literature Concentration (O: 1, 2, 3)**

While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since the fall of 2002, data has been collected only since the fall of 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 students' 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 concentration. Each portfolio is reviewed by two faculty members, and the results are tabulated with mean scores and median scores for each criterion. In the summer, the Assessment Coordinator meets with the directors of the four concentrations to analyze the data and make suggestions for procedural
and programmatic change. The suggestions are incorporated in the assessment report and then presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the semester.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

There was no target set for the Secondary English portfolio in the area of knowledge of language and linguistics, but starting in the fall of 2009, the literature concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 4) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. The knowledge of language and linguistics consists of the mastery of rhetoric, the ability to express a particular point of view within the discipline, and the understanding of audience issues in writing. By giving focused attention to this outcome, the department will have a more coordinated discussion about expectations concerning student knowledge of language and will gain a clearer sense of how to define and assess this aspect of English study. This outcome is also linked to the CTW work that is being done in the department's gateway and capstone courses since language is the form that critical thinking takes in our discipline. The CTW work will isolate elements of language knowledge and help students to build on basic language skills to be prepared for more complex activities.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean score for this outcome on the literature concentration's portfolios for 2008-2009 (from a total of 29 students) was a 4.2. The average is on the low end of the averages for the past five years (between 4.2 – 4.5). The average is also .3 less than the score for the outcome related to reading comprehension. This is in keeping with the results from the past five years, as interpretation scores are always slightly less than comprehension scores (with .1 -.3 difference in the mean averages).

**Target for O2: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

There was no target set for the literature portfolio in the area of critical thinking and interpretation, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in the literature concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 7) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. This outcome has been selected because the interpretation of texts constitutes one of the main tasks of English studies. While interpretation is related to the skill of comprehension, it involves more sophisticated critical thinking skills since it requires the ability to create meaning from the inferences and implications embedded in a text. This outcome is also closely related to the CTW work that is being done in the gateway and capstone courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean score for this outcome on the literature concentration's portfolios for 2008-2009 (from a total of 29 students) is a 4.2. This score is consistent with the results for this outcome of the past five years (for three years the average was 4.2 with slight variations for the other two years).

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

There was no target set for the literature portfolio in the area of effective written communication, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 8) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. This outcome has been selected because it is the skills component to Learning Outcome 4 (Knowledge of Language and Linguistics). Students who complete an English major are expected to be competent writers who understand the importance of rhetoric and can write in a variety of forms.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean score for this outcome on the literature concentration's portfolios for 2008-2009 (from a total of 29 students) was a 4.2. This score is consistent with the results for this outcome of the past five years (for three years the average was 4.2 with slight variations for the other two years).

M 2: Senior Exit Portfolio - Secondary English (O: 1, 2, 3)

The description for this measure is the same as the description for the exit portfolio in the literature concentration, with the exception that there is only one assessment form that is used for both the student assessment and department assessment (as of spring 2009).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

There was no target set for the Secondary English portfolio in the area of knowledge of language and linguistics in the 2007-2008 report, but starting in the fall of 2009, this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 4) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. The knowledge of language and linguistics consists of the mastery of rhetoric, the ability to express a particular point of view within the discipline, and the understanding of audience issues in writing. This knowledge is particularly needed for secondary teaching. By giving focused attention to this outcome, the department will have a more coordinated discussion about expectations concerning student knowledge of language and will gain a clearer sense of how to define and assess this aspect of English study. This outcome is also linked to the CTW work that is being done in the department's gateway and capstone courses since language is the form that critical thinking takes in our discipline. The CTW work will isolate elements of language knowledge and help students to build on basic language skills to be prepared for more complex activities.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average in the area of knowledge of language and linguistics for the Secondary English concentration (for a total of 31 students) is a 4.2. Previous years' scores for this outcome were in the 3.7-4.3 range, so this suggests relative success in this area.

**Target for O2: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

There was no target set for the Secondary English portfolio in the area of critical thinking and interpretation, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 7) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. This outcome has been selected because the interpretation of texts constitutes one of the main tasks of English studies. While interpretation is related to the skill of comprehension, it involves more sophisticated critical thinking skills since it requires the ability to create meaning from the inferences and implications.
In last year’s report, faculty in this concentration set a target of 4.0 for this area. Like the other concentrations, Secondary English plans to continue emphasizing this outcome in future assessments.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Secondary English portfolios from this assessment cycle earned a mean average of a 4.3 in this area, meaning that they exceeded the target. This score is in the middle of the range of the five-year average (ranging from 3.9 – 4.5).

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

There was no target set for the Secondary English concentration in the area of effective written communication, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 8) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. For the Secondary English concentration, this outcome is reconfigured to express the knowledge of the language of poetry; hence, the criterion on the portfolio assessment forms reads, “Knowledge of Rhetorical Strategies and Literary Aesthetics.”

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for this outcome from three classes of the Secondary English Senior Seminar in 08-09 (with a total of 46 students) is a 4.2. Over the past five years, this outcome has scored within a 4.0 – 4.3 range.

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

While no target was set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for this outcome from three classes of the Secondary English Senior Seminar in 08-09 (with a total of 46 students) is a 4.2. Over the past five years, this outcome has scored within a 3.7 – 4.6 range.

**Target for O2: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

While no target was set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for this outcome in the area of critical thinking and interpretation for this concentration is a 4.6. This matches the highest score earned for this area in 06-07.

Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

There was no target set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for the interpretation learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolios (from a total of 21 students) is a 4.3 for students in the fiction section of the concentration and a 3.7 for students in the poetry section. (In response to the action plan from the 2007-2008 report, portfolio scores for fiction and poetry were calculated separately.) The 4.3 fiction score is in keeping with the average of the past five years. The 3.7 poetry score is considerably below the average.

**Target for O2: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

There was no target set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

The mean averages for the knowledge of language learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolios (from a total of 21 students) are a 4.3 for students in the fiction section of the concentration and a 3.7 for students in the poetry section. (In response to the action plan from the 2007-2008 report, portfolio scores for fiction and poetry were calculated separately.) The 4.3 fiction score is in keeping with the average of the past five years. The 3.7 poetry score is considerably below the average.

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

There was no target set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean averages for the interpretation learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolios (from a total of 21 students) are
a 4.4 for students in the fiction section of the concentration and a 3.8 for students in the poetry section. (In response to the action plan from the 2007-2008 report, portfolio scores for fiction and poetry were calculated separately.) The 4.4 fiction score is in keeping with the average of the past three years (it was added as a criterion in 06-07). The 3.8 poetry score is considerably below the average.

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

There was no target set for the Creative Writing portfolio in the area of knowledge of language and linguistics in the 2007-2008 report, but starting in the fall of 2009, the Creative Writing concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 8) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. This outcome is reconfigured for the Creative Writing concentration to read "ability to produce authentic and engaging writing." A student who completes an English major with a Creative Writing concentration should be able to produce fiction or poetry (depending on the student's choice of genre) that satisfies these two expectation. [Preview Formatting]

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for this learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolio (from a total of 21 students) are a 4.3 for fiction students and 3.8 for poetry students. The 4.3 score was in keeping with the gradual strength that has been demonstrated in this criterion over the past five years. The 3.8 score is in range with the lowest score given for this criterion in 2004-2005.

**M 6: Senior Exit Portfolio - Rhetoric & Composition (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The description for this measure is the same as the description for the Senior Exit portfolio in the literature concentration.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

While no target was set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. (In Creative Writing, this outcome is configured with the following language on the assessment form for the senior seminar: knowledge of composition and aesthetics). Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The average mean for this learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolio is a 4.6. This score is in the higher end of the five-year results for this outcome, with a range of 3.9 – 4.9.

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

In last year’s report, a target of 4.3 was set for this outcome (which is configured in Creative Writing with the criterion that reads "ability to create original, authentic, and engaging writing"). Special attention will continue to be given to this area in future assessments.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The average mean for this learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolio is a 4.6; therefore, the target was exceeded. This score also marks the highest average earned in this area over the past five years.

**M 5: Senior Seminar - Creative Writing Concentration (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The description for this measure is the same as the description for the Senior Seminar in the literature concentration.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

While no target was set for this outcome in the previous report, special attention will be given to this area in future assessments. (In Creative Writing, this outcome is configured with the following language on the assessment form for the senior seminar: knowledge of composition and aesthetics). Findings for this year will be reported on to set up a baseline for determining the target for next year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The average mean for this learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolio is a 4.6. This score is in the higher end of the five-year results for this outcome, with a range of 3.9 – 4.9.

**Target for O3: Ability to produce effective written communication**

In last year’s report, a target of 4.3 was set for this outcome (which is configured in Creative Writing with the criterion that reads "ability to create original, authentic, and engaging writing"). Special attention will continue to be given to this area in future assessments.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The average mean for this learning outcome in the Creative Writing portfolio is a 4.6; therefore, the target was exceeded. This score also marks the highest average earned in this area over the past five years.

**M 6: Senior Exit Portfolio - Rhetoric & Composition (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The description for this measure is the same as the description for the Senior Exit portfolio in the literature concentration, with the exception that there is only one assessment form for the student and the department in this concentration.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Knowledge of language and linguistics**

There was no target set for the Rhetoric/Composition portfolio in the area of knowledge of language and linguistics, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty of this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 4) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. (For the Rhetoric and Composition concentration, this outcome appears on the portfolio as the criterion that reads "Knowledge of the Language and the History of Rhetoric,") The knowledge of language and linguistics consists of the mastery of rhetoric, the ability to express a particular point of view within the discipline, and the understanding of audience issues in writing. By giving focused attention to this outcome, the department will have a more coordinated discussion about expectations concerning student knowledge of language and will gain a clearer sense of how to define and assess this aspect of English study. This outcome is also linked to the CTW work that is being done in the department's gateway and capstone courses since language is the form that critical thinking takes in our discipline. The CTW work will isolate elements of language knowledge and help students to build on basic language skills to be prepared for more complex activities.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The mean average for the criterion concerning knowledge of the language and history of rhetoric (from a total of 21 students) is a 3.8. That is the lowest score for this criterion in five years of reporting. Previous years’ scores ranged from 4.1 - 4.5.

**Target for O2: Ability to think critically and to interpret texts**

There was no target set for the Rhetoric/Composition portfolio in the area of critical thinking, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in this concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 7) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. (The criterion related to this outcome on the Rhetoric/Composition portfolio reads, "Ability to Think Critically through Writing.") There was no target set for the literature portfolio in the area of critical thinking and interpretation, but starting in the fall of 2009, the faculty in the literature concentration will give particular attention to this outcome (outcome 7) as one of the three outcomes that are essential to the unique aspects of the English degree. This outcome is also closely related to the CTW work that is being done in the gateway and capstone courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

This is the first year that Rhetoric and Composition concentration has addressed this outcome as a criterion on their portfolio
Instruct faculty members in the focus on three learning outcomes

Highlight the importance of the evaluative essay in the Creative Writing portfolio

Instruct faculty members in the focus on three learning outcomes

Consider relationship between CTW and assessment work

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Instruct students about three highlighted learning outcomes
Faculty members who are teaching the senior seminar will devote the equivalent of at least one class period to instruction about the senior exit portfolio and will emphasize to students that while the portfolio will be assessed with the full list of learning outcomes in mind, special attention will be given to the way that the portfolio reflects their knowledge of language and linguistics, their ability to interpret texts, and the effectiveness of their written communications.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and faculty members teaching the senior seminar
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Investigate possibility of requiring Secondary English students to take Practical Grammar
(Secondary English) While the scores for knowledge of language and linguistics earned by students in the Secondary English concentration for the portfolios and senior seminars in the past year were strong, the faculty members who teach in this concentration have voiced a concern about students’ understanding of the way language operates. This is of particular concern because many of these students will go on to teach about language issues to middle school or high school students. Consequently, these faculty members will investigate the possibility of requiring Secondary English concentration majors to take the Practical Grammar course (finding out how often the class can be offered, how many faculty members are willing to teach this course, and how this requirement would affect the program.).

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and members of the Secondary English Committee
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Post exemplary portfolios on department website
Each concentration will post one or two samples of exemplary portfolios to the English department’s website for the purposes of providing students with useful models and of helping faculty members achieve a greater shared understanding of the expectations of this assessment tool.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment coordinator and faculty member in charge of each concentration
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Revise assessment forms for Creative Writing and Rhetoric/Composition senior seminars
To emphasize the department's assessment focus on language, interpretation, and effective writing, a criterion for “critical thinking and the ability to interpret texts” will be added to the assessment forms for the Creative Writing and the Rhetoric/Composition concentrations since this criterion was not included in past assessments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Set target for learning outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation
A 4.2 score will be set as the target for the learning outcome related to critical thinking and the interpretation of texts for all four concentrations and for the portfolio and the senior seminar assessment tools.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Set target for learning outcome related to effective written communications
A 4.3 score will be set as the target for the learning outcome related to effective written communications for all four concentrations and for the portfolio and the senior seminar assessment tools.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Set target for learning outcome related to language and linguistics
A 4.2 score will be set as the target for the learning outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics for all four concentrations and for the portfolio and the senior seminar assessment tools.
track assessment results for poetry and fiction students

(Creative Writing) The Creative Writing faculty will track portfolio and senior seminar assessment results next year to see if scores achieved by poetry students continue to be notably different from the scores achieved by fiction students. Since last year's assessment report, the department has not made any academic changes to the undergraduate program based on last year's action plan. However, during the course of summer 2009 when we began to look at this year's data, we decided to make a significant shift in the way we look at our assessment data. Rather than continuing to use all twenty-two of the undergraduate learning outcomes in the assessment process, we will highlight three learning outcomes that are essential to English study: the knowledge of language and linguistics, the ability to think critically and interpret texts, and the ability to produce effective written communications (this last outcome being the skills counterpart to the outcome related to the knowledge of language). We intend to continue using the assessment forms that cover the full range of learning outcomes, and in our yearly review, we will look at all the results to see if any obvious problem areas emerge. But our primary focus will be on these three outcomes and how students across the four concentrations demonstrate—in their senior exit portfolios and their senior seminars (our two undergraduate assessment tools)—their understanding of language and their abilities to interpret and write effectively.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

To begin with, last year's assessment report included targets for various learning outcomes in three of the four concentrations, and the results show that all these targets were met or surpassed in every case except for the Rhetoric and Composition portfolios. That concentration had set the target of 4.1 for all the content goals and a target of 4.3 for all skills goals. For the seven criteria listed on the Rhetoric and Composition portfolios, all the results were between .1-.3 short of the goals that were set. When the portfolio and senior seminar results from 2008-2009 are analyzed in terms of the three learning outcomes we have decided to highlight, we note the following observations: In the literature concentration, the results are in the 4.2 – 4.4 range, all within the middle of the scores that have been produced for these outcomes in this concentration for the past five years. This suggests that the literature program is on track and its students are producing work that fulfills the department's expectations. In the Secondary English concentration, the scores are within the 4.2 – 4.6 range. These results are all either at the high end of the five year average or they indicate a new high for a particular outcome. It should be noted that the faculty in this concentration spent a considerable amount of time last year reviewing and revising their assessment forms. It is therefore likely that faculty conveyed information about these revisions to students through the senior seminar for Secondary English and consequently helped to foster the improvement seen in the scores. In the Creative Writing concentration, this was the first year that assessment results for fiction students were separated from those for poetry students. A noticeable difference emerged in both the portfolio and senior seminar scores, with fiction students earning marks that were .6-.8 above those of the poetry students. Additionally, the fiction scores were in keeping with the averages of the past five years while the poetry scores were in most cases below them. The Creative Writing faculty want to track these results next year to see if the same difference exists between the genres, in which case they will decide what can be done to bring greater consistency to their program. In the Rhetoric and Composition concentration, the senior seminar results were within the 4.3–4.7 range, and all these scores were at the middle or top end of the five year averages. The portfolios, on the other hand, were in the 3.8-4.2 range, which were the low end of the five year averages. The reason for the relative strength in one assessment tool and weakness in the other is not immediately obvious. The Rhetoric and Composition faculty have done considerable work in the past two years on revising and systematizing their assessment process. It is possible that students would benefit from greater instruction about the expectations for the portfolio and that additional normaling could be done by the faculty to be sure that portfolios are being read with similar expectations. The department is setting targets for these three outcomes, and for the first time is going to create targets that...
go across all four concentrations (rather than creating separate targets within each concentration). We are establishing a 4.2 as the target for the knowledge of language and linguistics and for the ability to interpret texts while a target of 4.3 is being set for effective written communications. These targets are not particularly challenging, but during this past year, six out of twenty-six scores did not reach the level of these targets. So, our goal for next year is to have all concentrations reach these basic levels for these three outcomes. In subsequent years, we can determine if we want to raise the level of the standards as we strive to improve student performance in these areas.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Our department made a number of operational changes last year as a result of our assessment report: we changed all of our assessment forms to include a criterion for “overall evaluation”; we changed the senior seminar assessment forms to distinguish failures due to poor work from failures due to absences; we significantly revised the Secondary English concentration’s assessment forms so that they are most useful to students and more streamlined for faculty; we did research on DFW rates and discovered that the failure rate in the senior seminar is no greater than the rate in other upper level English classes; and we put a system into place whereby poetry scores could be distinguished from fiction scores. All of these procedural changes have helped to improve the effectiveness of our assessment process and to provide greater clarity about our assessment goals.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Our decision to switch from examining the results of twenty-two learning outcomes to examining just three is going to have a substantial effect upon our assessment review. By looking at a few particular outcomes that are essential to our program in depth rather than attempting to cover the whole spectrum, we anticipate that we can better track our students’ progress and that we will be able to generate more meaningful ideas about methods for improvement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

At the end of 2009-2010, assessment results will be tabulated for all learning outcomes and the Assessment Coordinator will review them for any obvious problem areas. But when discussing the results with the various concentration heads, the Assessment Coordinator will ask them to focus on the three outcomes related to language, interpretation, and writing. The faculty of each concentration will meet at the beginning of the fall 2010 to review the results and discuss their implications. Our anticipation is that these focused discussions will produce substantial reflection on each concentration’s progress in achieving its goals for English education.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 English Creative Writing MFA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Assure mastery of content knowledge**
The department will strive to assure that MFA students master the content knowledge related to the Creative Writing concentration to the level that is expected for masters work.

**G 2: Encourage scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**
The department will emphasize the importance of a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in masters work, in particular in the thesis writing.

**G 3: Foster effective written communications**
The department will work to foster effective written communication skills in MFA students.

**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.

**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. They will also be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry and fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre.

**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 sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**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 writing to create work of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**SLO 5: Effective Communication Skills (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken communications.

**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.

**SLO 7: Evaluative Skills (M: 1)**

Students will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: M.F.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Starting in the fall of 2007, students who entered the M.F.A. Program were required to complete a thesis by the end of their program. While we had hoped to develop and begin using the thesis assessment tool by the spring of 2009, more time was needed to create a system for this assessment process that would guarantee that each thesis is evaluated in this manner. Starting in the fall of 2009, students who finish their thesis will be assessed by their thesis director, using a form (with a 6-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes. The assistant to the Graduate Director will be responsible for making sure the assessment forms are completed. A student will not be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

#### Target for O1: Content Knowledge

A general target of 4.5 out of 6 was set for this measure for all criterion, but theses that were completed in 2008-2009 were not assessed in this manner as the assessment tool was not finalized until the end of the spring semester. One complication with the thesis is that there is no thesis defense; hence, there is not a set meeting that can provide the opportunity for the thesis committee to fill out the assessment form together, as there is in the case of the dissertation. Given this, the department has had to work out another system whereby the assistant to the Graduate Director will contact each thesis committee to make sure that a thesis assessment form is completed so that the student who wrote the thesis can be advanced for graduation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings for this measure as the assessment tool was not finalized until the end of the spring semester.

#### Target for O5: Effective Communication Skills

Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.F.A. thesis, the department decided to set a basic threshold of 4.5 out of 6.0 for all the criteria used in assessing the thesis. The data that is generated from this year's results will enable the Director of Creative Writing 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.

**M 2: M.F.A. Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)**

M.F.A. students in the Creative Writing Program 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 literary vocabulary, 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 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.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

#### Target for O1: Content Knowledge

In the 2008-2009 assessment report, no target was set for the M.F.A. exams.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This is the first year that the results for the M.F.A. exams have been separated out from the results for the Ph.D. exams. The results indicate that the M.F.A. exams are less successful than the Ph.D. exams. 14% of M.F.A. students earned a high pass (as compared to 42% of Ph.D. students); 71% earned a pass (as compared to 44%); and 14% earned a low pass (as compared to 11% who earned a low pass and the 3% that failed).

#### Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies

---
In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all M.F.A. exams stating the intention that fewer than 15% of examinees would earn a low pass or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's were only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Target for O3: Craftsmanship**

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all M.F.A. exams stating the intention that fewer than 15% of examinees would earn a low pass or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's were only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**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 a list of criteria to accompany the M.F.A. thesis assessment form, similar to the criteria developed for the PhD dissertation assessment tool.

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

**Set target for M.F.A. exams**
The department will set a target that fewer than 15% of examinees will earn a low pass or a failure on exams taken in fall of 2009 or spring of 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M.F.A. Exams
- **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** This target will take effect in the fall of 2009 and be applied to the M.F.A. exams taken in this semester as well as in the spring 2010 semester.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Director of Creative Writing
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Set target for 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 is generated from the 2009-2010 results will enable the Director of Creative Writing 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M.F.A. Thesis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** This target will take effect in the fall of 2009 and will be applied to the M.F.A. theses completed in the fall of 2009 or the spring of 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Director of Creative Writing
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Track the MFA exam results in 2010**
Since MFA exam results trailed those of the PhD exam results by a noticeable margin, Creative Writing faculty will pay attention to the results that emerge next year to see if a pattern exists. It should be noted that only 5 MFA exams were taken each semester in the 2008-2009 school year (as compared to 18 PhD exams in the fall and 18 in the spring), so the pool of students reflected in these results is quite small in number. All the same, the Creative Writing faculty intend to track next year’s results to see if the disparity between student performances in the two programs continues to be significantly different.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M.F.A. Exams
- **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the Creative Writing concentration and Creative Writing faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Next year, the MFA program will primarily gather more data from the MFA theses and exams that can be used to decide upon strategies for improvement for the following year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment tool for the MFA thesis was intended to be utilized last year, but this did not get accomplished because the thesis assessment forms were not finalized until the end of the spring semester and it was discovered that a system needed to be put in place to trigger the assessment of the thesis (in the case of the dissertation, the assessment is done automatically at the dissertation defense).

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

While the findings from the MFA exams may be less positive than the PhD exams, five out of six exams were awarded a score of at least a pass, indicating that MFA students are generally succeeding in their program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Last year, the department finalized the assessment tool for the MFA thesis but not before the end of the semester. This form will be used in the assessment of MFA theses this year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The challenges the department has with systematizing the assessment process for the MFA thesis last year revealed the need for specific guidelines for the thesis to be made available to both MFA students and faculty members. The Graduate Director will formulate these guidelines and make sure they are attached to the prospectus form which a student must get completed before embarking upon the thesis project.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The department expects 100% compliance with the assessment of the MFA theses.
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Mission / Purpose
The M.Ed. major in English Education provides for master's level study in English Education and English content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary English (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals
G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge experts
The first goal for students in the English education MEd program is to become experts in the English subject discipline and the pedagogical content knowledge required to deliver high quality lessons.
G 2: Continue to practice critical reflection skills
The students in the English education MEd program will understand the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. The students will use critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

G 3: Commit to achievement of urban students
Students in the English education MEd program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

G 4: Integrate English content with technology
The students in the English education MEd program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the English discipline. The use of technology will be a part of the curriculum, instruction, and reflection practices of the MEd English teacher. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which MEd English teachers communicate with their students, other teachers, and school personnel.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge: Reading & Writing (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature (G: 1) (M: 2)
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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques (G: 1, 3) (M: 3)
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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars (G: 1) (M: 4)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of English grammars as well as the history and evolution of the English language.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wtg (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge: Reading & Writing
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

M 2: Portfolio Rating Std 3 Knowledge of Literatures (O: 2)
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the
standard on knowledge of literatures through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 Assessment (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on effective use of assessment and instructional techniques through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 Know Eng Grammars (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for this standard will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on knowledge of English grammars through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 6 Learning Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 7 Prof Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 7 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Know Literary Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 5 Instructional Practic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Use of technology to complete portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing the portfolio requirement for the MEd degree requires the use of multiple technologies integrated into student reflection, artifacts, and writing. The results for this measure will be determined by successful completion of all portfolio requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Continued innovation in teaching for urban sites and technological savvy**

All of the target measures for the 2008-2009 group of English education MEd students were met. We, the English education faculty, are interested in fostering innovation in our students’ work as teachers. To that end, we are committed to including a focus on urban education sites and the students and communities served by those sites. We are also committed to infusing our courses with technology so that our students can bring technological savvy to their teaching practices in their own urban and metropolitan schools. Our action plan, then, is to continue to find ways to bring issues specific to urban education into coursework and portfolio reflections, while also weaving thoughtful uses of technologies into both course and portfolio requirements. Our digital portfolio and all of its embedded standards will continue to support this action plan.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** English Education Faculty
ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

To achieve our action plan item (focus on urban education and innovation with technologies in literacy classrooms), we plan to consider ways that our degree program might be more attractive to a larger potential group of students. That is, as a faculty we will review our course syllabi and portfolio requirements, as well as the coursework and portfolio reflection that are composed by our students, to consider how well these students are addressing issues pertinent to urban education sites and their uses of technologies in developing both coursework and portfolio requirements. We will also consider possibilities for repackaging our program, with possibilities including an interdisciplinary approach.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

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, professional development, inquiry, collaboration, and technology use. With respect to Action Item 1 from 2007-2008: "Increase Publicity in the English Ed M.Ed.", program faculty revised and updated website information regarding certain program information documents, such as: 1) entrance and coursework requirements overviews, 2) the flowchart with the sequence of coursework, and 3) directories with program faculty contact information. The program faculty, and the program coordinator specifically, were available to answer questions online and in person for prospective students. During the 2008-09 school year, 5 new students began their MEd program in English education.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our students met all of the measures we set for performing knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching and learning as set in our portfolio standards. With this success in mind, we can focus on our commitment to urban education and innovation with technologies in literacy classrooms. As we continue to review the progress of our students in the MEd program, we are mindful of trends in master degrees to be interdisciplinary. The number of students entering the program each year continues to be fewer than 10 students, so it may be that we need to consider the packaging of our MEd degree. For instance, would it be advantageous to move our program into a New Literacies degree? A possible direction for our degree program, a focus on New Literacies would focus on the myriad technological, visual, and multimedia ways in which literacies are practiced in the 21st Century. We will consider this and other possibilities for growing our program while providing solid opportunities for innovation in teaching in urban schools and integrating technologies into literacy classrooms.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
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Mission / Purpose

The M.A.T. major in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees in English. It leads to both a master's degree and certification for teaching secondary English language arts (grades 6-12). The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program is a cohort program that encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education. 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.
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, MSIT, our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta, the nation, and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity to push the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Acquires English content pedagogical knowledge
English education students acquire and demonstrate a knowledge base and ability to teach in language and literature, in literary theory, and in the processes of reading and composing, including speaking, listening, and viewing.

G 2: Effectively plans, teaches and manages instruction
English education students effectively plan for, teach (or execute) instruction for students in an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning for students from diverse backgrounds.

G 3: Committed to excellence in urban English education
English education students demonstrate a commitment to and are sensitive to the complexity of teaching English language arts to students in urban settings and develop methods, strategies, and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. English education students foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

G 4: Uses reflection and inquiry to inform practice
English education students reflect critically and consistently on their practice in order to improve their instruction, students' learning, and their professional development.

G 5: Uses technology in teaching English language arts
English education students apply knowledge of effective learning technologies to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the English language arts classroom.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Involves school and community in learning (G: 3) (M: 1)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

Institutional Priority Associations

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 (G: 2) (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

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 (G: 3) (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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 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 5: Practices professional reflection (G: 4) (M: 5, 10)</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 6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (G: 1) (M: 6)</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>O/O 7: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 5) (M: 7)</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 8: Can effectively plan for instruction (G: 2) (M: 8)</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 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 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 10: Can motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 10)</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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community (O: 1)**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

80.77% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.

**M 2: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning (O: 2)**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

82.14 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

**M 3: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity (O: 3)**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

81.93% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.

**M 4: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment (O: 4)**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

67.86 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands and used assessment for learning" at the expected level.

**M 5: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection (O: 5)**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
85.71 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

**M 6: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy (O: 6)**
Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O6: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
85.54 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

**M 7: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication (O: 7)**
Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O7: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
85.71% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Uses communication skills and technology" at the expected level.

**M 8: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning (O: 8)**
Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O8: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
72.62 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.

**M 9: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies (O: 9)**
Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
80.25 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.

**M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage (O: 5, 10)**
Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered...
into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O10: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

83.33 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> TEEMS English Education Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources:</strong> Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are now embedded within our coursework that link communities and schools to student learning. In the future, we would like to keep this curriculum change unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> TEEMS English Education Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources:</strong> Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> TEEMS English Education Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources:</strong> Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivate/Manage Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to develop and use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Planning Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment opportunities within our coursework that will allow our students to plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Strategies Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Student Learning Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand a student's intellectual, social, and personal development and to plan instruction that will support such development.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our strategies include studying the assignments within our courses and making revisions as articulated in Questions 1 and 2, with the standards in mind. One strategy we use is to work collaboratively to make collective decisions about curriculum changes, student progress, and program goals. Another strategy we use is to strive to understand and communicate with our students on a regular basis, and to act and offer support as necessary while upholding the standards. An additional strategy is to work collaboratively with mentor teachers and GSU supervisors who have administrative and/or classroom experience in urban schools. This provides our students with professional and experienced educators/administrators' insights into teaching and working in urban schools specifically. We intend to continue to revisit our curriculum in our courses in light of student achievement, student responses to our curriculum, and recent findings in research, theory, and practice, all of which inform our own instruction in teacher education and our students’ working with their students.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
As a faculty, we have made several modifications to our English Education MAT program. 1) The portfolio standards have been aligned with methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). This allows for a seamless connection between the methods course content and practicum experiences in the field so that our students can reflect on, execute, and theorize their practice. 2) Through new course assignments, we have encouraged stronger understandings and year-long inquiry into issues related to literacy in urban settings. This emphasis gives our students concrete activities for thinking and learning about students in urban schools and the diverse needs of these school populations. This curriculum modification supports our students’ continued learning about both community and diversity (Action Item I and Action Item II in the 2007-2008 report). The new assignments also foster relations among university faculty, secondary school teachers, and our GSU master’s students (an area of attention in the 2007-2008 report). Finally, this latest curriculum change allows our students to have immediate access to the College of Education mission to focus on urban schools. 3) Through another set of course assignments we have also created opportunities for students to explore and execute new literacies in the context of their urban classrooms. The technology required to complete these assignments reflects literacy and technology connections as well as the new Professional Standards Commission initiative to integrate technology into all course curricula.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on the data of our students' performance during the 2008-2009 school year, we have made several changes in our curriculum. These changes include: a) aligning the portfolio standards very closely to the curriculum content in the methods and field-based courses (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630) and b) implementing a digital composition activity to support an inquiry into urban education. These data also help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. We see our work in this program as being a continual work in progress. That is, the changes we institute in our program are direct reflections on the urban schools that we serve, the changing needs of our diverse students at Georgia State University, and in response to innovative teaching, research, and theory in the field of English education.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---
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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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Assure mastery of content knowledge**

The department will strive to assure that MA students master the content knowledge related to their particular concentration (whether Literary Studies, Creative Writing, or Rhetoric and Composition) to the level that is expected for masters work.

**G 2: Encourage scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**

The department will emphasize the importance of a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in masters work, in particular in the thesis writing.

**G 3: Foster effective written communications**

The department will work to foster effective written communication skills in MA students, whether they are in the Literary Studies concentration, the Creative Writing concentration, or the Rhetoric and Composition concentration.
### 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. |

| 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. |

| SLO 4: Knowledge of theory (Literature) (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. |

| SLO 5: Skills of Inquiry (Literature) (M: 1, 2) |
| Students will be able to formulate effective questions for master's level research. |

| SLO 6: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) (M: 2) |
| 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. |

| SLO 8: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing) (M: 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. 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. |

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

| O/O 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. |

| O/O 7: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing) (M: 2) |
| 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 and fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre. |

| O/O 9: Revising Skills (Creative Writing) (M: 2) |
| Students will be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of both published and student writing and to offer specific and constructive criticism. They will also be able to evaluate the range of critical responses from fellow students and to revise their creative works. |

| O/O 10: Knowledge of History of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 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). |

| O/O 11: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 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. |

| O/O 12: Knowledge of Practice of Rhetoric (R & C) (M: 2) |
| Students will have mastery of typical practices of academic writing (e.g., research paper, research proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews, websites 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 of multiple purposes). |

| O/O 13: Effective Communication Skills - all concentrations (M: 1, 2) |
| Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts. |

| O/O 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. |

| O/O 15: Evaluation 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. |
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M1: Assessing student performance in the M.A. Pro-Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15)

Since the spring of 2008, the English department has required M.A. students in literature and Rhetoric/Composition concentrations to take the Pro-Seminar in the second semester of their program. Since then, this requirement has been dropped for Rhetoric/Composition M.A. students since the faculty members in this concentration have determined it would be better for them to develop a Pro-Seminar for their own students. In the spring of 2009 the instructors of the literature Pro-Seminar were requested to assess student work in this course, using an assessment form with criteria that are aligned to the graduate learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

#### Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)

In the 2008-2009 assessment report, the department set a target of 4.0 on all criteria of the assessment used for student work in the Pro-Seminar.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

On the assessment forms that were completed (for one section of the Pro-Seminar with 12 students), all areas received a score of 4.8 out of 5 with the exception of two criteria (“appropriate scholarly vocabulary that demonstrates understanding of concepts important to literature study” and “understanding of the history, structure, and/or social implications of language”) that received a 4.9 out of 5. The achievement target was easily met. The impressive results were also reflected in the instructor's comments about the individual students which note that five of the students have finished a prospectus that is ready for a thesis committee, six students have a prospectus that is nearly ready, and only one student needs to do continued research on his chosen topic to determine if it is viable for a thesis-length project.

### M2: M.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Starting in the fall of 2007, students who entered the M.A. Program were required to complete a thesis by the end of their program. While we had hoped to develop and begin using the thesis assessment tool by the spring of 2009, more time was needed to create a system for this assessment process that will guarantee that each thesis is evaluated in this manner. Starting in the spring of 2010, students who finish their thesis will be assessed by their thesis committee (using a form that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes). The committee chair will be responsible for calling an assessment meeting after the thesis work has been submitted, and the assistant to the Graduate Director will be responsible for checking to see that the assessment forms are completed. A student will not be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

#### Target for O1: Content Knowledge (Literature)

A general target of 4.5 out of 6 was set for this measure for all criterion, but theses that were completed in 2008-2009 were not assessed in this manner as the assessment tool was not finalized until the end of the spring semester. One complication with the thesis is that there is no thesis defense; hence, there is not a set meeting that can provide the opportunity for the thesis committee to fill out the assessment form together, as there is in the case of the dissertation. Given this, the department has had to work out another system whereby the director of a thesis will call the thesis committee together to take part in an assessment meeting concerning the student's work. The assessment form will then be turned in to the assistant to the Graduate Director. If this form is not submitted, the assistant to the Graduate Director will contact the committee chair since without the submission of this information, the student cannot be advanced for graduation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

There are no findings for this measure as the assessment tool was not finalized until the end of the spring semester.

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

**100% completion of Pro-Seminar assessment**

Because the assessment form for the Pro-Seminar was finalized at the end of the spring 2009 semester, only one of two Pro-seminar instructors had the opportunity to assess the students’ performance. One action for 2009-2010 is to guarantee that assessment forms are filled out for each of the Pro-Seminar classes that is taught in the spring semester.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Assessing student performance in the M.A. Pro-Seminar  
**Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge (Literature)

**Implementation Description:** Instructors will complete the assessment forms at the same time that they submit grades for the spring semester.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** The Assessment Coordinator will distribute assessment forms to the Pro-Seminar instructors during the spring semester. The instructors will be responsible for completing them.

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Create guidelines for the MA thesis**

Since the thesis is still a fairly new requirement for the MA students (previously, students were given the option of the MA thesis or additional classes and a non-thesis paper), the Graduate Studies Committee has recommended that additional guidelines be made available for entering MA students, outlining the expectations of the thesis. These guidelines should include details about the assessment process. The Graduate Director will create this form before the end of the spring semester and it will be attached to the prospectus form.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
Develop consistency in the Pro-Seminar instruction

Now that the Pro-Seminar has been piloted in 2007-2008 and run as an established course in 2008-2009 (and assessed as part of the M.A. assessment plan), the department recognizes a need to develop some consistency across different sections of this course. The Graduate Director will establish a description of elements that are critical to the instruction for this course and make this information available to Pro-Seminar instructors before the spring 2010 semester.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Assessing student performance in the M.A. Pro-Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge (Literature)
Implementation Description: The Graduate Director will complete this course description by October of 2009 to make available to Pro-Seminar instructors as they plan their syllabus for the spring semester.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Initiate the thesis assessment meeting

Starting in the spring of 2010, the director of a thesis that has been completed will call the thesis committee together for a meeting to assess the student's thesis work. At this meeting, the committee will complete the thesis assessment form and turn it into the assistant to the Graduate Director so that the student's thesis can be advanced for graduation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

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 the criteria used on the thesis assessment form. The data that is generated from the 2009-2010 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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge (Literature)
Implementation Description: The target for the M.A. Thesis will be apply to any thesis completed in the 2009-2010 academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator, Graduate Director, and assistant to the Graduate Director
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Set target for the M.A. Pro-Seminar

To build upon the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department will set a general target of at least a 4.5 in all areas on the assessment form.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Assessing student performance in the M.A. Pro-Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge (Literature)
Implementation Description: This target will be in effect as of the start of the 2009-2010 academic year. It will be applied to the Pro-Seminar classes that are taught in the spring of 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

One concern with the Pro-Seminar is that the instructor of the second section of this course did not provide assessment results for the students. Additionally, anecdotal evidence suggests that the two sections of the course were taught very differently. This raised
the concern that there should be more consistency in both the instruction and assessment of this important course. The Graduate Director will provide instructions for future Pro-Seminar instructors to clarify the critical elements of the course that need to be included on the Pro-Seminar syllabus.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department made one change in the M.A. program, as anticipated in last year’s action plan, in creating and implementing an assessment tool for the literature Pro-Seminar class. The assessment tool for the M.A. thesis was also intended to be finalized and utilized, but this did not get accomplished because the thesis assessment forms were not finalized until the end of the spring semester and it was discovered that a system needed to be put in place to trigger the assessment of the thesis (in the case of the dissertation, the assessment is done automatically at the dissertation defense).

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment results from one section of the Pro-Seminar suggest that this course is proving to be quite successful. Eleven out of the twelve students in this section have written a final or penultimate draft of their prospectus. In addition, two thirds of these students have already contacted a faculty member to serve as the chair of their thesis committee. Students have expressed appreciation with the Pro-Seminar as it gives them instruction on how to write a thesis; it provides examples of successful prospectuses and thesis projects; and it hones their writing skills in terms of succinctness, diction, syntax. The high assessment scores across the board suggest that the Pro-Seminar is effective in asking students to engage in work that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes as they are in the early stages of their program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The Pro-Seminar assessment form was created and implemented last year, and the results have enabled the department to get a sense of the success of this course. The department also finalized the assessment tool for the MA thesis but not before the end of the semester. This form will be used in the assessment of MA theses this year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The challenges the department has with systematizing the assessment process for the MA thesis last year revealed the need for specific guidelines for the thesis to be made available to both MA students and faculty members. The Graduate Director will formulate these guidelines and make sure they are attached to the prospectus form which a student must get completed before embarking upon the thesis project.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The department expects greater compliance with the assessment of both the Pro-Seminar and the MA thesis.
The department will work to foster effective written communication skills in PhD students, whether they are in the Literary Studies concentration, the Creative Writing concentration, or the Rhetoric and Composition concentration.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: 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 contents. Doctoral study aims for graduates to have greater mastery of content than masters level work.

**SLO 2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical approaches to reading literature and will be able to apply this knowledge 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 demonstrate a higher degree of critical sophistication than master's level work.

**SLO 3: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing) (M: 1, 2)**

Ph.D. students will demonstrate a familiarity with representative examples of writing by major figures, English and American literary history, and form and theory in both fiction and poetry.

**SLO 4: 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.

**SLO 5: 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.

**SLO 6: 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 writing to create work of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

**SLO 7: 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).

**SLO 8: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric (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.

**SLO 9: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (M: 1, 2)**

Students will have mastery of typical genres of academic writing (e.g., research paper, research proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews, websites 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).

**SLO 10: Effective Communications 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.

**SLO 11: Researching Skills - all concentrations (M: 1)**

Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates will be able to isolate a fruitful question for extended, in-depth investigation and to carry out focused, productive, and thorough research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

### 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, which uses a 6-point scale, 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. Those suggestions are brought to the Graduate Studies Committee in early fall for review.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)**
In the 2008-2009 assessment report, the department set a rolling target to raise the score of the student knowledge of major theoretical approaches and ability to apply this knowledge in the interpretation of material chosen for the dissertation to a 4.5 over the next three years.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

While the dissertation results reflected an increase in six out of eight criteria, the score for the knowledge of major theoretical approaches and ability to apply theory to the dissertation study remained the same at a 4.3. Therefore, the rolling target of a 4.5 has not yet been met.

**M 2: Ph.D. Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

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 is 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.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature)**

No specific targets were set for the Ph.D. exams in the 2008-2009 assessment report.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The 36 Ph.D. exams that were taken during the 2008-2009 academic year produced results that were substantially above the results of 2008-2009 (the only other year with assessment information on the exams). 42% of students earned a high pass (as compared to 19% in the previous year); 44% of students earned a pass (as compared to 60% in the previous year); and 11% earned a low pass while 3% failed (as compared to 22% of low passes in the previous year).

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

**Revise the second learning outcome**

The graduate studies committee has suggested that the scores for the learning outcome related to the knowledge and application of literary theory may be low because not every dissertation makes extensive use of literary theory but instead may incorporate other conceptual frameworks that draw upon critical approaches and/or historical contexts. In revising the outcome, we are broadening the definition of what counts as a theoretical approach in dissertation work; as a result, the criterion used for this outcome on the dissertation assessment form will now read as follows: "This dissertation demonstrates a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts appropriate to the topic."

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Ph.D. dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Set target for the Ph.D. exams**

To build upon the improvement in the Ph.D. exams scores this year, the department will set a target that fewer than 15% of examinees will earn a low pass or fail on exams taken in fall of 2009 or spring of 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Ph.D. Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature)
- **Implementation Description:** This target will take effect in the fall of 2009 and therefore will apply to exams taken in that semester as well as in the fall 2010 semester.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Set target on dissertation for Knowledge and Application of Critical Approaches, Theoretical Frameworks, and Historical Contexts**

This will be the second of three years that the department will set a rolling target of a 4.5 for this outcome, which now will be expressed as the knowledge and application of critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the dissertation work. During the year, the department will engage in discussions about ways to ensure student success in the application of a conceptual framework in their dissertations. Specific actions to accomplish this task include informing faculty members of this change in the language of the second graduate learning outcome at the October 2009 department meeting and encouraging them to advise the PhD candidates they are working with to make sure that they are critically engaged with a particular theoretical framework in their dissertation writing. Secondly, the Graduate Director will provide additional instruction to students about this requirement of the dissertation in his advisement of students and in the materials that describe the PhD program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** Ph.D. dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)

**Implementation Description:** This target will continue throughout the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator, Graduate Director, and graduate faculty as a whole

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department will work to assure that PhD students demonstrate a scholarly engagement with a theoretical approach in their dissertations, though now with the understanding that students can use critical approaches, theoretical concepts, and/or historical contexts to establish their conceptual framework. This will be done through two specific measures: graduate faculty will be informed of this priority at a fall department meeting and will be asked to advise the PhD candidates they work with about the importance of this aspect of the dissertation work, and the Graduate Director will communicate with graduate students about this expectation in his advisement work and in communications about the PhD program available to students on the English department website.

---

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No significant changes have been made in the assessment tools used to evaluate the Ph.D. program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment results suggest that the dissertations which were completed during the 2008-2009 academic year were more successful than those defended in the previous year. It should be noted that these scores did not quite return to the level of results earned in 2006-2007 (the first year we kept assessment data on dissertations), but this is likely due to the fact that dissertation committees were awarding “outstanding” scores to certain criteria on the assessment form in that first year. Since then, it has been clarified that the “outstanding” is to be reserved for stellar work that is ready for publication and therefore that score has been used less frequently. The fact that the score for knowledge and application of theory did not improve suggests that the department still needs to give explicit attention to this area. The improved scores in the Ph.D. exams are also encouraging. Although the exams cannot be read specifically in terms of the graduate learning outcomes, they do give the impression of general success in the three concentrations of the Ph.D. programs.

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

While no changes were made to the operational procedures for the assessment done in the Ph.D. program, this year brought a new assistant to the Graduate Director. A transitional period was needed to orient this staff person to the intricacies of graduate assessment, and she has begun to institute procedures to better ensure the accuracy and completeness of the assessment data.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

We anticipate that the operational procedures for Ph.D. assessment will remain the same, though the accuracy and thoroughness of the assessment data is likely to improve with the work of the new assistant to the Graduate Director.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We anticipate an improvement in Ph.D. work related to the learning outcome that addresses knowledge and application of a theoretical approach in the dissertation work.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Executive Doctorate in Business**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Executive Doctorate in Business program offered by the J. Mack Robinson College of Business of Georgia State University helps executives develop these capabilities by teaching them how to apply relevant knowledge and research skills to contemporary business problems. It also addresses the lifelong learning needs of intellectually active professional adults who already possess advanced degrees in their fields but wish to continue their education to the highest level.
## Goals

### G 1: Executive Doctorate in Business Goals
The Ph.D. program of J. Mack Robinson College of Business will develop in graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring: (1) education in theory; (2) education 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: Seeing the big picture (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will advance the knowledge and expertise required to identify, understand, and successfully tackle the interdisciplinary, big picture issues that characterize global business management today.

### O/O 2: Honing the skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will develop in the student the skills in formal social inquiry required to define and address complex issues and to disseminate knowledge related to their profession in a variety of professional and public outlets “to influence professional activity and public policy.”

### O/O 3: Giving the global perspective (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will give an interdisciplinary, globally oriented perspective that is unavailable in traditional advanced degree programs.

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1, 2, 3)
The program will have six content courses to provide students with knowledge about global business leadership and five courses on research practices, design and analysis to equip the students with the understanding required to undertake formal research. Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 average in coursework. Students must earn a C or better in all courses. Students who do not meet these requirements or who are struggling to meet them are counseled out of the program.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

### M 2: Group projects (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the second and third semesters, students participate in research projects in groups of two to three people, under the supervision of a senior researcher. Each project will address a contemporary business issue and be conducted with the objective of publishing the results.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

### M 3: Independent research (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the fourth, fifth and sixth semesters, each student engages in an independent research project under the supervision of a senior researcher. This project addresses a business issue affecting the student's firm. Each student will produce and defend a doctoral thesis with the expectation of publishing it.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

## Georgia State University

### Assessment Data by Section

#### 2008-2009 Exercise Science BS

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

## Goals

### G 1: Problem Solving
Exercise science students will become better problem-solvers.
G 2: Critical Thinking
Exercise science students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking skills.

G 3: Content Knowledge
Exercise science students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline.

G 4: Preparation for relevant positions
Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline including corporate, community, commercial, and clinical centers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Effective practical skills (G: 1, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate a high level of practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program.

   General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
   2 Oral Communication
   3 Collaboration
   4 Critical Thinking
   6 Quantitative Skills

   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
   3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

   Strategic Plan Associations
   3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
   6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 1: Health Fitness Specialist certification (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Graduates of this program will be able to function at the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist level.

   Relevant Associations: Program has become accredited by the 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

   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
   3.31 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

SLO 2: Fitness Assessment skills (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate effective fitness assessment skills

   General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
   2 Oral Communication
   4 Critical Thinking
   6 Quantitative Skills

   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
   4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

   Strategic Plan Associations
   6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Knowledge of exercise and fitness science (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise science

   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
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

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 4: Demonstrate competence with technology (G: 1, 4)

Students will have a level of competence that will enable them to effectively use contemporary technology to serve clients.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

### 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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

### Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Ensures safety in physical activity settings. (G: 1, 3, 4)

Provide information about insuring the safety of clients and training in safety and first responder.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

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

### SLO 6: Special populations (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Students will be able to assist individuals with special physical needs such as those with cardiovascular disease, obesity, hypertension.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2 Oral Communication
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
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
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

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

#### ACSM Examination Procedures

Students will begin taking the required ACSM examination during the Fall of 2009. Meetings will be held with all students registered for KH 4750 Practicum in Exercise Science to inform students of the examination requirements and to conduct a review session. Practice examinations have been posted on ULearn that allow students to check their readiness for the examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jeff Rupp, Program Coordinator Other exercise science faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The following strategies are being implemented:
1. Monitoring the effect of increasing hands-on experiences for students on the availability of laboratory space for faculty and student research.
2. Development of practice examinations and student review sessions as students begin to take the required national certification examination as a graduation requirement.
3. Refinement of the student program evaluation instrument that is completed during the internship.
4. Discussion of the development of a new course that would replace KH 3020 Performance and Analysis: Fitness and Aerobics. This course would emphasize exercise leadership and equipment use.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based on analysis of program outcomes as well as information from student program evaluations conducted at the end of their degree program, the faculty make the following conclusions:
1. Students needed more hands-on laboratory experiences.
2. The existing laboratory sections for KH 3550 and KH 4630 were non-credit laboratories that included significant amounts of student work and needed to be addressed.
3. The existing course names for KH 2220 and KH 2230 did not accurately reflect the course content.
4. KH 3610 Motor Learning and Development (4 hours) was a required course that covered content area not directly applicable to exercise science as outlined by accreditation requirements. As a result of the information listed above the following curriculum changes were made:
   - KH 3020 Performance and Analysis: Fitness and Aerobics was moved from the required to the elective area.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Analysis of the past year's assessment data indicate that overall, the program is achieving the intended goals and outcomes. Work is progressing relating to the implementation of a required national certification examination which will take effect during the Fall of 2009. Several questions remain including whether a passing score on the examination can be required in order for students to graduate, number exam attempts allowed, and the development of practice exams and review sessions for students. A concern has been raised about the addition of more laboratory sections for classes. The department laboratory space is used for both instructional as well as research activities. The increasing number of students in the program may necessitate multiple lab sections which may negatively impact the availability of the space for research. This will be monitored during 2009-2010 academic year.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The MS degree program in Exercise Science seeks to contribute to the KH Department's mission, which seeks to discover new knowledge and advance the understanding of the role of physical activity in attaining optimal health and well-being, educate members of society and prepare future professionals, and promote healthy lifestyles through life-long activity and learning. This mission includes research and scholarly activity, instruction, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, and health and physical education. The M.S. program in Exercise Science 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.

**Goals**

G 1: Knowledge
Students will gain knowledge of Exercise Science.

G 2: Skills
Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in their chosen Exercise Science field.

---

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science (G: 1) (M: 1)**

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: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 1, 2, and 7. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O/O 2: Apply knowledge to practical situations (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**

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: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 3 and 4. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O/O 3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**

Students should demonstrate knowledge of basic equipment, facility requirements, absolute and relative contraindications, procedures, and protocols for the exercise test.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: 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 accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (G: 1) (M: 4)**

Students should understand and interpret research in exercise science and should understand issues associated with clinical testing and research involving human subjects, including informed consent.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.6, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.8, 2.6.0.4, and 2.6.0.5. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)**

Written examinations and quizzes in KH courses 6280, 7500, 7510, 7550, 7620, 8270, and 8390.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
### Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science

75% scoring at or above 80% on exam

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 89% of students (75 students) scoring at or above 80% on exams/quizes in the following classes: KH 6280, 7500, 7550, 7620, 7630, and 8390. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.

### M 2: Practical Exams (O: 2)

Oral arrhythmia examination and laboratory exams

Source of Evidence: Performance (rectal, exhibit, science project)

#### Target for O2: Apply knowledge to practical situations

90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

95% of students (43) demonstrated proficiency in the following courses: KH 7500, 7550, and 8390. These findings exceed the 90% target level.

### M 3: GXT practical exam (O: 3)

Practical exam assessing students’ ability to administer graded exercise tests to various populations

Source of Evidence: Performance (rectal, exhibit, science project)

#### Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing

90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

In the classes (KH 7550 and 8390) that used GXT practical exams, students (23) 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

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### Target for O4: Understands research and human subjects issues

90% of the students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

In the classes that used case studies and labs (KH 6280, 7500, 7550, and 8390), students (53) demonstrated success in this measure, with 94% of the students demonstrating proficient knowledge and understanding. Overall average passing rate exceeded 90%.

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

#### Monitor and maintain current strengths

We will continue to monitor future achievement in order to maintain standards due to the finding that all achievement levels were met.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **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:** 2009-2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science Faculty

#### Review and/or Revise Outcomes/Objectives

Review and/or revise outcomes/objectives to ensure they best reflect outcome requirements associated with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs and/or industry best practice standards

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  #### 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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Exercise science faculty have agreed to meet regularly (e.g., monthly) to discuss assessment issues as well as other exercise science matters.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Exercise Science faculty and graduate faculty committee changed graduate curriculum to mandate that all Exercise Science students in the Fitness and Health Promotion concentration take an American College of Sports Medicine certifying exam as required by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Assessments demonstrated that students possessed a high level of knowledge and ability in exercise physiology and related sciences.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Changing the curriculum to establish an avenue for the national certifying examination was the primary improvement in our assessment plan.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings indicate that students are meeting the instructional goals and that we should monitor and maintain our current approach. However, as indicated before, we are beginning to review our current outcomes/objective measures.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Critical review of current outcomes/objectives and measures by exercise science faculty at regular meetings may result in the modification of current outcomes/objectives and/or the addition of new measures.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Finance BBA
As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

Description: 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.

Goals

G 1: Students will develop problem-solving skills
G 2: Students will develop quantitative skills used in financial analysis
G 3: Students will gain very broad knowledge of finance
G 4: Students will be prepared for financial practice
G 5: Students will use critical thinking in financial decision-making

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: The development and application of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 3)
BBA-Finance students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

SLO 2: The development and application of technical skills (M: 1, 3, 4)
These technical skills that we would like BBA-Finance students to develop and apply include: (i) Be proficient in capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance. (ii) Possess technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Possess the necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building. (iv) Possess 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.

SLO 3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
(i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

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 1a for findings from Fall 2008 and Exhibit 1b for findings from Spring 2009. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in Exhibit 2 (see hyperlink for Exhibit 2 in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge
Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills
Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their development of technical skills meet our targeted levels.

Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills
Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills meet our targeted levels.

M 2: National performance indicator: ETS (O: 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.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills
GSU Finance majors should be at the 90th or above national percentile in Finance, and above the median in all other disciplines.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The attached document shows the performance of Finance majors on the ETS examination. The performance level meets targeted levels in most categories and we are monitoring closely the few categories where they need to meet the achievement target.

M 3: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)

This measure relates course level student outcomes to program level learning outcomes. See hyperlink for Exhibit 2 for details showing how student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map well with program learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge

At least 15% of the questions selected from course-level assessment of students should test the development of foundation knowledge outcome/objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The 15% of questions selected from course-level assessment of the students map well onto the program level learning outcomes indicating good alignment of learning outcomes.

Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills

At least 25% of the questions selected from course-level assessment of students should test the development of technical skills outcome/objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The 25% questions selected from course-level assessment of the students map well onto program level learning outcomes indicating good alignment of learning outcomes.

Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

At least 50% of the questions selected from course-level assessment of students should test the analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills outcome/objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The 50% of questions selected from course-level assessment of students map well onto program level outcomes indicating good alignment of learning outcomes.

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 study assignments, offered in conjunction with FI 4391 "Field studies in finance", allow students to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects that are of implementable interest to these organizations. Feedback over the last several years indicates high levels of satisfaction of employers and high levels of applied learning on the part of student participants.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills

Supervising managers at the respective corporations will provide assessment as to the development of students’ technical skills.

Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

Supervising managers at the respective corporations will provide assessment as to the development of students’ analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills.

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

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Enhance student practical training | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

Implementation Description: continues
Responsible Person/Group: Professor Rasha Ashraf

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. With the finance major, this program has begun to be integrated within our FI 4020 course, which is a required course for all finance majors.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Practical training
The field study in finance course "FI4391" has been 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). This has become increasingly important given the global recession and loss of employment in the financial and non-financial sectors of the economy. We will continue to seek and expand the number of participating corporations to provide students the opportunity to acquire worthwhile and relevant practical experience.

Student performance on representative questions selected from the three major courses of FI4000 ("Fundamentals of Valuation"), FI4040 ("Fundamentals of International Finance"), and FI4300 ("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 2007-2008 action plan, the following activities are noted. (1) Careers and professionalism. Several initiatives took place under the leadership of Professors Rasha Ashraf, Craig Ruff, and Genna Brown. 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 services class speakers. Speakers from both the RCB's Career Management Center and the University Career Services were brought in to discuss the job-search process and to describe the resources available to students from the university. (2) Practical training. Progress was made in further identifying additional corporate partners for the offering of field study opportunities for undergraduate finance majors. (3) Communication skills. The Critical Thinking through Writing initiative is increasingly becoming an important component of FI4200, which is required of all finance majors.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
A new course coordinator, Professor Rasha Ashraf, will oversee the implementation of the career component enhancement in FI 4000. All faculty teaching FI4020 will become increasingly versed in the Critical Thinking through Writing initiative. All clinical faculty will be expected to develop and supervise field study course opportunities.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Student performance on representative questions selected from the three major courses of FI4000 ("Fundamentals of Valuation"), FI4040 ("Fundamentals of International Finance"), and FI4300 ("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 2007-2008 action plan, the following activities are noted. (1) Careers and professionalism. Several initiatives took place under the leadership of Professors Rasha Ashraf, Craig Ruff, and Genna Brown. 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 services class speakers. Speakers from both the RCB's Career Management Center and the University Career Services were brought in to discuss the job-search process and to describe the resources available to students from the university. (2) Practical training. Progress was made in further identifying additional corporate partners for the offering of field study opportunities for undergraduate finance majors. (3) Communication skills. The Critical Thinking through Writing initiative is increasingly becoming an important component of FI4200, which is required of all finance majors.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
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 continue to integrate the University's Critical Thinking Through Writing initiative into the finance major. Professor Richard Fendler is serving as the Department's Ambassador in support of the University's efforts to implement this initiative.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
We have appointed faculty to oversee each critical action plan component: Professor Rasha Ashraf for the careers component in FI 4000; Professor Richard Fendler for the critical thinking through writing initiative in FI 4020; and Professor Milind Shrikhande for the enhancement of practical training through FI 4391.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What data for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Overall targets continue to be met indicating that the Department continuous to be a college leader in terms of the quality of students
We will continue to be diligent in ensuring a high quality program for students.

Administrative Question 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will continue to pursue similar strategies that have been successful in the past. We hope to show continued improvement but the downturn in the economy and budget cuts will present a serious challenge.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Finance MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Description: The Master of Science degree program with a major in Finance is designed for individuals with an undergraduate business degree seeking an advanced knowledge of Masters level finance, including particular expertise in a chosen area of specialization (one of Corporate Finance, Investments, or Financial Institutions and Markets). The goal of the program is to provide students with the skills necessary to understand the context for issues encountered in the rapidly evolving financial environment, to analyze alternative financial scenarios and to develop effective policy initiatives. The program provides graduates with the technical skills needed to support a complete understanding of advanced issues in finance as well as with the analytical, conceptual and integrative skills needed to achieve a high degree of success in their careers in finance.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of finance and related fields
Students will develop knowledge of the discipline of finance and related business practices.

G 2: Conceptual and technical skills development
Students will develop conceptual and technical skills necessary for financial model building and analysis.

G 3: Problem-solving skills for real world application
Students will develop problem-solving skills used in the analysis of commonly encountered issues in the practice of finance.

G 4: The development of critical thinking skills
Students will develop critical thinking skills for analyzing complex financial issues.

G 5: Professional leadership skills
Students will be prepared to join senior management levels in financial and non-financial organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: The development and application of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)
MS-Finance students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: The development and application of technical skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Technical skills that MS-Finance students will develop and apply include: (i) Proficiency in capabilities in information technology as they relate to finance. (ii) Technical capabilities for analyzing the financial condition and performance of a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) The necessary conceptual and technical skills to be proficient in financial model building. (iv) 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.

O/O 3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
MS-Finance students will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be
exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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 1a for findings from Fall 2008 and Exhibit 1b for findings from Spring 2009. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in Exhibit 2 (see hyperlink for Exhibit 2 in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

Median scores shall be at or above 80%, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 80%, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their development of technical skills meet our targeted levels.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 80%, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are learning at the expected level of performance and that their analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills meet our targeted levels.

**M 2: 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. Over the last five years, survey responses have indicated fairly high satisfaction levels with curricula and teaching and learning processes within the MS-Finance program. See hyperlink for Exhibit 3.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge**

At or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are in the attached document. The high scores in the responses indicate student satisfaction on their development of foundation knowledge at targeted levels.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

At or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are in the attached document. The high scores in the responses indicate student satisfaction on their development of technical skills at targeted levels.

**Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills**

At or above two year moving average.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings are in the attached document. The high scores in the responses indicate student satisfaction on their development of analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills at targeted levels.

**M 3: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)**
See hyperlink for Exhibit 2 for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8360) align with program learning outcomes. This alignment indicates that the representative questions testing student learning outcomes are well aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Alignment findings are in the attached document. The questions selected for course-level assessment of the students map well onto the program level learning outcomes, indicating good alignment of student learning outcomes.

### Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Alignment findings are in the attached document. The questions selected from course-level assessment of the students map well onto the program level learning outcomes indicating good alignment of student learning outcomes.

### Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
Each representative course shall cover at least two-thirds of all program learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Alignment findings are in the attached document. The questions selected from course-level assessment of the students map well onto the program level learning outcomes, indicating good alignment of student learning outcomes.

### 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 study assignments, offered in conjunction with FI 8391 "Field studies in finance", allow students to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects that are of implementable interest to these organizations. Feedback over the last several years indicates high levels of satisfaction of employers and high levels of applied learning on the part of student participants.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills
Supervising managers at the respective corporations will provide assessment as to the development of students' technical skills.

### Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills
Supervising managers at the respective corporations will provide assessment as to the development of students' analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills.

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

#### 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 2008-09 at approximately 640, 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 few years. The Department continues to review its curriculum to identify new courses that will help better prepare students to succeed in the changing marketplace. Looking forward to the 2009-2010 academic year, we are seeking to add two new courses that will provide students with important skills sets. These courses include "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and "Hedge funds and their trading strategies."

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  * Measure: MS-Finance Exit Survey Responses  
  * Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills  
  * Implementation Description: continuous  
  * Responsible Person/Group: Professors Milind Shrikhande and Gerry Gay

#### Practical training
Our experience in developing and offering the field-study in finance course FI 8391 continues to prove 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:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Program marketing and innovation

We believe that there is a potential executive audience for the MS-Finance program who desires a strong cohort format with an emphasis on academic training in corporation finance. Thus, we have initiated plans to launch such a program during 2010. In addition, we will continue to bring the attention of students pursuing an MBA degree, whether in finance or another related concentration, the benefit to their skill set that an MS-Finance program offers. Along these lines, we have developed a template that guides students in selecting and scheduling courses in such a way to most efficiently earn joint MBA and MS degrees in finance. We are furthering efforts to attract students in the PMBA program to similarly complete the MS-Finance degree requirements in an efficient manner.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2010 and continuous
Responsible Person/Group: Professors Milind Shrikhande and Alfred Mettler

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are seeking and receiving support from both RCB leaders as well as the business community in our efforts to launch an executive style cohort version of the MS-Finance degree. A major strategic component is the creation of an external board of advisors comprised of leading financial executives who will provide guidance, student mentoring, and publicity to the broader business community.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department's assessment continues to indicate that the specialization streams of corporation finance, investments, and financial institutions are maintaining both currency and relevancy to the educational and career needs of MS-Finance students. Still, we have initiated plans to launch two new courses during 2010 that will respond to the curricular needs and training of our students. These two courses are "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." Also, our efforts to attract high quality 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 earlier action plan, the following activities are noted.

1) Curriculum: To expose 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, accommodations were made to students seeking multiple specializations.

2) Practical training: Success was observed in identifying new corporate partners for establishing additional field study courses. 3) Going forward, we will continue to actively market our joint MBA/MS in Finance degree program to those in both the MBA and PMBA programs.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our analysis of the findings shows that expectations on all outcomes/objectives are currently being met. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the Department will continue to pursue opportunities for refinement of the 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. The findings also indicate that there is opportunity to pursue programmatic and curricular enhancement. In response, the Department is the process of launching (1) a new executive style cohort based version of its MS-Finance degree, and (2) two new courses during the upcoming academic year titled "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and "Hedge funds and their trading strategies."

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Several. First, we have appointed Professor Alfred Mettler to serve as the core course coordinator for the Corporate Finance class "MB 8135." Second, to support the administrative and marketing needs of the new executive version of the MS-Finance program, we have appointed Professors Milind Shrikhande, Alfred Mettler, and Craig Ruff. Initial feedback is that the structural changes are helping promote the quality of the program and student success.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Overall targets continue to be met indicating that the Department continuous to be a college leader in terms of the quality of students produced. We will continue to be diligent in ensuring a high quality program for students.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will continue to pursue similar strategies that have been successful in the past. We hope to show continued improvement, but the downturn in the economy and budget cuts will present a serious challenge.

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2008-2009 French BA**  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of francophone countries, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas.

**Goals**

G 6: Knowledge of Francophone Literatures

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.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

O/O 6: Knowledge of Francophone Literatures (G: 6)

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing

Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

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

**Adding Courses**

The French section has added one new course for the new concentration in French Studies, and more are under consideration

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Planned
- **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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition**

Students demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts.

**SLO 2: Communication -- Written**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

**SLO 3: Communication -- Oral**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Oral Communication

**SLO 4: Communication -- Visual**

Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.

**SLO 5: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations**

Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6 Quantitative Skills

**SLO 6: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving**

Students effectively and appropriately apply quantitative methods to geographical problems.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6 Quantitative Skills

**SLO 7: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)**

Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 8: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)**

Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 9: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection**

Students effectively collect appropriate evidence.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 10: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**
Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 11: Technology
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students appropriately use computers and other technology appropriate to geography.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

SLO 12: Collaboration
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration

SLO 13: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 14: Contemporary Issues -- "Global"
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

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

Improve critical-thinking skills of Geography majors
Critical-thinking learning outcomes had the lowest scores among all the outcomes; therefore, critical-thinking skills of Geography majors need to be improved.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Improve scores on Outcome 10 in GEOG 4764
In order to improve scores on Outcome 10 (Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation) in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography), the instructor will provide students with solid examples of appropriate evaluations of claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2009

Increase the number of measures for certain outcomes
It has been determined that the program needs at least six measures per learning outcome. There were 82 outcome/measure combinations for the 2008-2009 assessment, thereby yielding a mean value of six measures per outcome. To reach the minimum number of six measures per outcome, the following is needed: at least five additional measures for Outcome 4 (Communication – Visual) and Outcome 5 (Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations); at least three additional measures for Outcome 6 (Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving), at least two additional measures for Outcome 8 (Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)), Outcome 9 (Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection), and Outcome 11 (Technology); and one additional measure for Outcome 3 (Communication – Oral), Outcome 12 (Collaboration), and Outcome 13 (Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines). Therefore, a high-priority area is increasing the number of measures for outcomes linked to quantitative skills, visual communication, and critical thinking.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The action plan goes beyond improving student critical thinking on essay
examinations in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography). The department needs more Geography majors in order to produce a more robust assessment of student learning. In addition, at least five measures are needed for each learning outcome. For the 2008-2009 assessment, six of the 14 outcomes had fewer than five measures. Finally, faculty need to structure their courses around the chosen learning outcomes for their courses; therefore, faculty will be provided with available learning options well before course preparation for the 2009-2010 academic year.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No significant changes were made to the learning-outcomes assessment.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that the department is doing an adequate job enabling Geography B.A. students to meet the learning outcomes. The department ultimately would like to change the target score to 4.0, and considering that target value, the department could improve with five of the 14 learning outcomes. Based on the mean score of the mean scores for each of the measures of a learning outcome, outcomes 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 equaled or exceeded 3.7 but were less than 4.0. Therefore, faculty should focus on improving student skills in foundational-knowledge acquisition, written communication, oral communication, arithmetic operations, and question formulation as part of critical thinking.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Geography MA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Overall Goals**

Overall goals reflect university emphasis on retention and graduation in a timely manner (two years for full-time students). Geosciences also wishes to increase the quality of graduate students, as measured through GPA and application scores (GRE) although we recognize that “quality” is measurable in a number of ways.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection (M: 1)**

Students collect appropriate evidence.

**SLO 2: Foundational Knowledge Acquisition (M: 1)**

Students demonstrate knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts.

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation (M: 1)**

Students evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses appropriately.

**SLO 4: Communication -- Written (M: 1)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 5: Technology (M: 1)**

Students use computers and other technology appropriate to geography effectively.

**SLO 6: Communication -- Oral (M: 1)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.

**SLO 7: Collaboration (M: 1)**
Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

**SLO 8: Communication -- Visual (M: 1)**
Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.

**SLO 9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines (M: 1)**
Students effectively develop contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**SLO 10: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations (M: 1)**
Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.

**SLO 11: Contemporary Issues -- "Global" (M: 1)**
Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

**SLO 12: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving (M: 1)**
Students apply quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively.

**SLO 13: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1) (M: 1)**
Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.

**SLO 14: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2) (M: 1)**
Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.

### 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).

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.8/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Foundational Knowledge Acquisition**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Communication -- Written**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Technology**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Communication -- Oral**
The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2008-2009 Geology Assessment of Core**  
*As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking (M: 1)**

The objective of the Geosciences Department (Geology BS program) is to develop and implement a means of assessing out student’s ability to think critically within our undergraduate core courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Collaboration</th>
<th>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.0/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O8: Communication -- Visual</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.7/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O9: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O10: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O11: Contemporary Issues -- &quot;Global&quot;</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O12: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.6/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O13: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.6/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O14: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</td>
<td>The mean score of students for each outcome equals or exceeds 4.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Finding for 6 graduating students from 5 faculty = 4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Geology BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 60 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

Goals
G 1: MS degree in Geology
Maintain and increase the number of students in the program.

G 2: MS degree in Geology (graduation rate)
Students should be completing the program on a timely basis.

G 3: Quality of Thesis research
Thesis research (for students enrolled in the thesis option) should be of high quality (well written, sound data, and sound interpretation, discussion and conclusions).

G 4: MS degree in Geology (non-thesis project)
Non-thesis projects should be well conceived (good research idea) and executed satisfactorily.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: MS Degree in Geology (enrollment) (M: 1)
A measurable outcome is to maintain and/or increase number of students graduating with MS degree in Geology.
O/O 1: MS Degree in Geology (enrollment) (O: 1)
For FA08-FA09, we enrolled three new students in the MS degree program. We need to increase the number of enrolled students.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target for O1: MS Degree in Geology (enrollment)
A reasonable target is five new graduate students enrolled per year.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
As noted, we enrolled three students.

O/O 2: MS Degree in Geology (Graduation rate) (M: 2)
Timely graduation of MS degree students.

O/O 3: MS Degree in Geology (quality of thesis) (M: 3)
Quality of thesis project is assessed on a 1-5 scale (5 = excellent, 4 = very good, etc) by the thesis director, graduate director or department chair. Basis of evaluation includes: depth and coverage of topic, quality of data, quality of interpretations, discussion and conclusions.

O/O 4: MS Degree in Geology (non thesis projects) (M: 4)
Non-thesis reports are assessed by the faculty directing the project on the basis of: depth of coverage of topic, quality of data collected, quality of interpretation, discussion and conclusions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: MS Degree in Geology (enrollment) (O: 1)
For FA08-FA09, we enrolled three new students in the MS degree program. We need to increase the number of enrolled students.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target for O1: MS Degree in Geology (enrollment)
A reasonable target is five new graduate students enrolled per year.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
As noted, we enrolled three students.

M 2: MS Degree in Geology (Graduation) (O: 2)
In FA08-SP09, we graduated four students with MS degree in Geology (Three thesis, one non-thesis).
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target for O2: MS Degree Geology (Graduation rate)
A good achievement target is five students per AY (SP-FA).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
We are not meeting this target.

M 3: MS Degree in Geology (quality of thesis) (O: 3)
Two students wrote MS degree theses in this period and were graded on 1-5 scale. Student 1: 5. Student 2: 3-4.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O3: MS Degree in Geology (quality of thesis)
We achieved target of a program generating good MS degree theses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
GEOS (GEOL) faculty members are generating good theses.

M 4: MS degree in Geology (non thesis project) (O: 4)
Non-thesis project is assessed in terms of quality of the work (topic, data collected, interpretation and discussion) by either the faculty member directing this non-thesis project, the graduate director, or department chair.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O4: MS Degree in Geology (non thesis projects)
Achievement target is for the student to produce a work that shows the student can identify a problem, collect and interpret data and present in a professional form (paper).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
The one student who opted for this non-thesis project carried out a brief study where data was collected, and results were written.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
We plan to recruit at national/sectional meetings. Devise recruiting materials. Make visits where practical.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the
coming academic year?
We have tried hard to recruit students to this program. This effort includes obtaining grants (external and internal) as well as direct recruiting by faculty members. Two grants (one internal and one external) were received in the reporting period which hopefully will translate to new students in FA 09. Note, Ph.D. students not considered here as they are enrolled in Ph.D. (CHEM-GEOL).

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We need to make more effort to recruit new students and see to their timely completion. One fact inhibiting completion is that we admit many students student (a high fraction of our students) on special status and thus take longer time to complete degree requirements. The quality of effort is high. Our students do good work and faculty members are engaged.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
From data relative to this year's assessment, faculty members throughout the department are interested members (high attendance at thesis oral exams). Students see this and aim to perform at a high level. We are clearing the decks of students who are attempting to finish degrees and encouraging them to complete degrees (where possible).

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
These data highlight the importance of our efforts and tell us our students are receiving quality educations.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
I anticipate more effort to recruit more students to the program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 German BA**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German speakers, 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.

**Goals**

**G 4: Writing in German**
The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.

**G 5: Knowledge of German Cultures**
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language cultures.

**G 6: Knowledge of German Literature**
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.

**G 7: Knowledge of German Business Concepts**
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.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 6: Knowledge of German Literature (G: 6)**
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with German literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret literary texts, including their cultural contents.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 German MA
(Assessment Data by Section)
(Include 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 written communication
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Pedagogical project or research paper
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.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Health & Physical Education BSED
(Assessment Data by Section)
(Include those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science Program in Health and Physical Education at Georgia State University is to develop competent leaders who provide and promote health and physical activity in P-12 schools. 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: Unknown (M: 1, 7)
Unknown

SLO 3: Unknown (M: 4)
Unknown

SLO 6: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 2)
Understands and uses assessment for learning

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Unknown (M: 1, 5, 8)
O/O 4: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 3)
Understands student development re: Learning

O/O 5: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 6)
Involves school and community in learning

O/O 7: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 10)
Uses communication skills and technology

O/O 8: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 1, 5)
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

O/O 9: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 7, 9)
Can motivate and manage students for learning

O/O 10: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives (M: 1, 5)
Can effectively plan for instruction

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Unknown (O: 1, 2, 8, 10)**

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Unknown**

A rubric is used to evaluate the portfolio. The goal is for everyone in the class to obtain an overall rating of 75%.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data for the 2009 Weavonline report was collected using the INTASC competency standards for knowledge/performance and dispositions. Courses selected for the End of Program INTASC ratings include the elementary and secondary student teaching courses (KH 4710 and KH 4720 respectively). Within these two courses, HPE faculty collaboratively identified assignments that reflected the objectives established for our students. Measures used to determine INTASC ratings include: supervisor’s final evaluations, cooperating teacher’s final evaluations and portfolio evaluations showing skill development or best work. To determine these ratings, the HPE faculty uses the INTASC standards proficiency levels for knowledge and performance. The HPE faculty collectively agreed that students completing the HPE program and being recommended for initial teacher certification should all be at Level 4: Proficient. At this level, "the candidate regularly demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistency in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification." Item by rating analysis at the end of the program indicates that, 85.7% of teacher candidates are at or above target Proficient with another 7.1% at or above target Advanced across all knowledge/performance and disposition competencies. The target set by faculty for all competencies was 75%. Students appear to be significantly above the established target. This data, however, reflects a lack of variability in the degree to which students meet the target standards at the Proficient level. Faculty agreed that a more meaningful assessment of student competencies would be to examine the candidates' ratings of the INTASC standards at the end of their program. There were 12 competencies for which the candidates' ratings were below the 75% criterion level set by faculty. Across these 12 items, candidates' competency ratings ranged from a high of 71% to a low of 23%. Further analysis and discussion among the HPE faculty resulted in the identification of two key categories/factors in which these competency ratings can be grouped, these are (a) assessment and (b)community/culture/diversity. It is in these two area that action plans will be identified.

**Target for O2: Unknown**

75%

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

See summary of findings from Outcome/Objective 1 above

**Target for O8: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

75%

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

See summary of findings from Objective 1 above

**Target for O10: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

75%

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

See summary of findings from Objective 1 above
**M 2: Unknown (O: 6)**

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O6: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009</strong> - <strong>Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTASC Items in the assessment category and the candidates' ratings in parentheses include: item 8.1 I know different assessment strategies and their uses for different purposes (71%); Item 8.2 I use a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate student's programs (35%); Item 8.3 I use results from assessment to modify instruction (71%). These values are all below the 75% criterion level established by HPE faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Unknown (O: 4)**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See findings summary for Standard 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: STARS Standard 9 Practices professional reflection (O: 3)**

Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Unknown**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See discussion under findings for Standard 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: STARS Standard 1 Demonstrates content pedagogical (O: 2, 8, 10)**

Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See discussion in findings section for Standard 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See discussion in findings section under Standard 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See discussion in findings section under Standard 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: STARS Standard 10 Involves school and community (O: 5)**

Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTASC Items in the community/culture/diversity category that were rated by students below the 75% criterion include: item 3.2 I create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners (64%), item 3.3 I relate learning to student's cultures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
families, communities and experiences (57%), item 10.2 I engage parents in participation in the school community (23%) and item 10.3 I use community resources to enhance instruction (28%).

M 7: STARS Standard 3 Can effectively teach diverse gro (O: 1, 9)
Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Unknown
75%

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
See discussion of findings and action plan items under Standard 6

Target for O9: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
75%

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
See discussion in finding section under Standard 7

M 8: STARS Standard 4 Knows and uses multiple instructi (O: 2)
Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Unknown
75%

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
See discussion of findings under Standard 7

M 9: STARS Standard 5 Can motivate and manage students (O: 9)
Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O9: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
75%

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
See discussion of findings under standard 7

M 10: STARS Standard 6 Uses communication skills and tec (O: 7)
Supervisor's final evaluations, final examinations and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O7: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
75%

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
See discussion of findings under Standard 7

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
6 strategies were identified to address this Standard
1. Focus groups or student interviews will help to gain insights from students regarding issues of community/culture/diversity 2. Student teachers will be assigned a graded assignment during opening school to assess the demographics of the school and the community in which the school is situated. 3. Student teachers will be required to attend a PTA meeting as part of their student teaching experience. 4. Student teachers should be encouraged, with the cooperating teacher's permission to contact a predetermined number of parents to give feedback on their child's performance. 5. As part of their analysis for their unit plan in student teaching, student teachers will be encouraged and evaluated on their ability to address how the skill they are teaching is applicable in the community. 6. As part of student teaching, student teachers will be required to send a letter to parents introducing the content their child will be working on in a given period of time (one week, grading period etc.)

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: STARS Standard 10 Involves school and community | Outcome/Objective: Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
Related Action Plan

Further analysis and discussion among the HPE faculty resulted in the identification of two key categories/factors in which the INTASC competency ratings can be grouped, these are (a) assessment and (b) community/culture/diversity. It is in these two areas that action items will be developed.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Three strategies selected to improve application of assessment in HPE

1. **Focus groups and asking questions about assessment during student exit surveys will be held to get more information from students regarding their challenges with assessment and recommendations for change.**

   - **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
   - **Implementation Status:** Planned  
   - **Priority:** High

2. **We have already had meetings to discuss the revision of the scoring system for STARS to create more variability in scores.** We have also begun discussions of conducting exit interviews and focus groups with students. Specific strategies to address the areas of assessment and community/culture/diversity have also been discussed and identified.

   - **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
   - **Implementation Status:** Planned  
   - **Priority:** High

3. **The target date was selected as two of the three action plan items can not be addressed until student teaching which begins in the spring semester.** Fulfillment of one of the action plan items relating to block classes will be addressed throughout the fall semester in the respective classes.

   - **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
   - **Implementation Status:** Planned  
   - **Priority:** High

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We have already had meetings to discuss the revision of the scoring system for STARS to create more variability in scores. We have also begun discussions of conducting exit interviews and focus groups with students. Specific strategies to address the areas of assessment and community/culture/diversity have also been discussed and identified.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year the HPE faculty identified inconsistencies in faculty INTASC ratings. This year, the HPE faculty collectively agreed that students completing the HPE program and being recommended for initial teacher certification should all be at Level 4: Proficient. At this level, "the candidate regularly demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard/standard element with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistency in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification." This year, the STARS standards provided no meaningful data as 100% of students met all 10 STARS standards. Thus, the HPE faculty agreed that a more meaningful interpretation would be an item by rating analysis at the end of the program which also resulted in 85.7% of teacher candidates being rated at or above target Proficient with another 7.1% at or above target Advanced across all knowledge/performance and disposition competencies. The target set by faculty for all competencies was 75%. Students appeared to be significantly above the established target. This data, however, reflects a lack of variability in the degree to which students meet the target standards at the Proficient level. This year, for the 2009 Weaveonline report, the HPE faculty agreed that a more meaningful assessment of student competencies would be to examine the candidates' ratings of the INTASC standards at the end of their program. There were 12 competencies for which the candidates' ratings were below the 75% criterion level set by faculty. Across these 12 items, candidates' competency ratings ranged from a high of 71% to a low of 23%. Further analysis and discussion among the HPE faculty resulted in the identification of two key categories/factors in which these competency ratings can be grouped, these are (a) assessment and (b) community/culture/diversity. It is in these areas that the HPE faculty agreed to develop action items. All other INTASC standards and STARS standards were deemed less of a priority given ratings of Target or above by both students and faculty.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data for 2008-2009 show that there is a discrepancy in the ratings of competencies between faculty and students. Student ratings seem to be better indicators of student competence than those of faculty. The faculty will need to develop rubrics/strategies/approaches to better determine the variability in performance achievement of the undergraduate HPE students. One approach discussed to date is to change the scoring system for STARS. In addition, student exit interviews and focus groups will be developed to better understand students perceptions of their competencies across the INTASC standards.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We will continue to monitor student achievement within the approved assessment plan, while looking for ways to improve the delivery of some courses and content within courses. For example, KH 3410 and KH 3420 used to be taken concurrently. KH 3420 has now...
been placed later in the program so that students can have initial experiences teaching students before taking an assessment class.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The data indicate that the HPE programs does many things very well including reflection and the teaching of pedagogical knowledge. The assessment component continues to present challenges and we are working on strategies to make this material more meaningful and applied. The issue of diversity/culture/community is identified as a new priority for the faculty.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Strategies identified for both assessment and community/culture/diversity include focus groups or asking questions relating to these two areas during student exit surveys. With regards to assessment, strategies identified include: incorporating assessment into lesson planning during block classes and student teaching. With regard to community/culture/diversity, additional strategies for improvement include the addition of assignments and additional expectations in selected classes including opening school and student teaching.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Health & Physical Education MEd**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Is committed to student learning and development**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be committed to increasing student learning and development

**G 2: Can apply expertise for learning and development**
Candidates use their content knowledge and expertise to help their students learn and grow

**G 3: Participates in profession’s learning communities**
Candidates work with colleagues to increase their content knowledge and use professional associations to help them grow

**G 4: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
Candidates will be able to manage and assess student learning. Using assessment results, candidates will make appropriate adjustments to their teaching to enhance student learning.

**G 5: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**
After teaching, candidates will reflect on their lessons, seeking ways to improve teaching effectiveness. Drawing from content and pedagogical knowledge, candidates will continually seek to increase their knowledge and teaching effectiveness.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan (M: 1)**
Candidates graduating from this program should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan effective teaching units of study for K-12 students

**SLO 4: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models (M: 4)**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to plan and teach using a variety of physical education and health instructional models

**SLO 5: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document (M: 5)**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to conduct research on a topic of interest and synthesize the findings in a written document

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching (M: 2)**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach K-12 students, reflect on their teaching effectiveness, and make appropriate modification for improving their teaching practice

**O/O 3: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers (M: 3)**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to supervise other teachers (preservice or inservice) and use systematic observation data to guide their supervision feedback
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: KH 7240 Unit plan (O: 1)
Students are required to plan a unit of instruction. The plan contains the necessary content (skills to be taught and teaching progressions), assessments used to measure student learning, provisions for feedback, and a management plan for executing/delivering the unit to their students.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan
A rubric is used to evaluate the unit plan. There are 9 cells for the various descriptors on the rubric with levels of unacceptable, acceptable, and target. The goal is for everyone in the class to be at acceptable or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
The class where the unit plan was used was offered fall 2008. Three students were below the criterion. Two of those students were unacceptable in one category will attaining a target level in 4 and 2 of the other categories, thus placing them above the acceptable level of performance. The third student was unacceptable in 5 of the 9 categories and only acceptable in the other 4. Here are the results of the class (U = unacceptable; A = acceptable; T = target): Student 1: 5 A, 2 T Student 2: 2 A, 7 T Student 3: 3 A, 6 T Student 4: 2 A, 7 T Student 5: 6 A, 3 T Student 6: 1 U, 4 A, 4 T Student 7: 5 A, 4 T Student 8: 5 U, 4 A Student 9: 4 A, 5 T Student 10: 1 A, 8 T Student 11: 1 U, 6 A, 2 T Scores on the content areas are as follows: Introduction/statement of context: 4 A, 7 T Needs assessment: 1 U, 3 A, 7 T Course Outline: 4 A, 7 T Instructional analysis: 2U, 6T, 3A Arrangement of resources: 1U, 6A, 4T Behavioral management strategies: 8A, 3T Monitoring system: 1U, 7A, 3T Evaluation system: 2U, 6A, 3T References: 10A, 1T

M 2: Teaching experience (O: 2)
Teacher candidates are required to teach a unit of instruction. The unit will last approximately 6 days (elementary) or 10 days (secondary). Candidates are required to reflect on the experience, submit videos of them teaching the classes, and a summary of the experience.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O2: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching
A rubric is used to evaluate the assignment. The achievement target for the class is for everyone to be at an acceptable level or higher according to the rubric definitions.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
A rubric with 13 descriptors is used to evaluate the assessment. Students can perform at an unacceptable (U), acceptable (A), or target (T) level. Four of the students performed at an unacceptable level for some of the descriptors: One student was unacceptable in 2 categories, two students were unacceptable in 3 categories, and one student was unacceptable in 9 categories. The following is a summary of student performance on the various categories: Subject knowledge: 2A, 9T Knowledge of growth and development: 2U, 2A, 7T Communicative skills: 1U, 4A, 6T Use of class time: 1U, 5A, 5T Instruction: 4U, 3A, 4T Evaluation of students: 4U, 1A, 6T Self evaluation: 2U, 3A, 6T Planning/preparation: 1U, 4A, 6T Teacher/Student interaction in class: 1U, 5A, 6T Class climate: 1U, 4A, 6T Class management: 5A, 6T Discipline: 5A, 6T Personal attributes: 3A, 8T

M 3: Project to demonstrate supervision competence (O: 3)
This project is a final project for the EDUC 8360 class. Following several exercises designed to teach them how to supervise others, teacher candidates are required to submit a final project where they actually do a live supervision with another teacher and then provide feedback to this teacher with the intent of improving teaching performance. Following the supervision experience, candidates are required to summarize the experience using data from the observation and a re-cap of the feedback provided to the person observed.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers
This course is designed around a mastery learning format. Students have multiple chances to achieve mastery on the project. The course is delivered online. Prior to this project students have watched a series of videos to gain competence in observing students in physical education classes. This project is a culminating project in the class where students use their skills in an authentic/live setting. The goal is for all students to perform at an acceptable level of performance using the rubric designed for the assignment.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students have done very well with this assignment. All students completed the project at an acceptable level of performance.

M 4: HPE Instructional models project (O: 4)
This project can be completed in either the health or physical education content area. Candidates are required to develop a unit of instruction using an instructional model that is most appropriate for the context in which the model will be taught. Candidates are then expected to teach the model to K-12 students and then reflect on the experience (successes, areas that could be improved, next steps to help them grow).
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O4: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models
The models project has several sections. Students are required to write a syllabus, develop a series of lessons for teaching the model, and then provide a summary of their perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Each of these categories have sub-sections. The goal is for all students to perform at an acceptable level using the criteria established for the project.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Assessing planning skills and knowledge

Five areas have been identified in which at least one student was assessed as "Not Met": Needs assessment, Instructional analysis, Arrangement of resources, Monitoring system, and Evaluation system. However, in most areas, only 1 or 2 students did not meet the stated criterion, so the deficiencies are not deemed to be severe. The course instructor will provide added emphasis on these areas in the future, and monitor students with formative assessments during each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
<th>Implementation Status: Finished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: KH 7240 Unit plan</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: This plan will go into effect in the fall of 2009, and remain in effect for all subsequent offerings of this course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 08/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund (Course instructor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessing Unit planning

While this standard was "Met" by all but one student, there was a scattering of "Not met" by a few students on some parts of this major project. The action plan is to conduct additional guidance as students plan this project, and to use formative assessments as they develop this project—rather than use summative assessments only. Starting in the spring of 2010 (next time this course is offered), the instructor will have developed rubrics for "progress reports" and assessments on this major project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
<th>Implementation Status: Finished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: HPE Instructional models project</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: This plan will go into effect with the next time this course is offered, in spring of 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 12/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (Course instructor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### assessment of supervision knowledge and skills

Students are performing well in this area. The action plan is to maintain this level of performance while monitoring students in subsequent course sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
<th>Implementation Status: Finished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**M 5: Research paper (O: 5)**

The purpose of this assignment is to develop teacher candidate ability to do research and then summarize the findings. After learning appropriate research development techniques, candidates do a research project and then present the findings both in a paper and during an oral presentation in the KH 7820 class.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O5: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document**

Students are required to identify a topic of interest and then do a literature review to discover new information. The final project is a research paper that summarizes student findings on the topic. The paper is between 10 to 15 pages. Students are required to present the paper orally in class. Other members of the class provide challenges to the paper and the person who wrote the paper is required to defend the findings and the position, if any taken on the paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students in the class did an exceptional job on this paper. All students performed at an acceptable level. Since this paper is near the completion of the program, one would expect students to perform at a high level on this project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students (N=11) taking the class in Spring 2009 developed an acceptable syllabus for the models project. When developing the plan for implementing an instructional model, all students were able to develop the unit context (important for making decisions regarding selection of the model), and modifications for implementing the model. Four of the students had difficulty writing behavioral objectives and two of them were unable to complete a satisfactory scope and sequence. All but one student provided detailed lesson plans for implementing the model and were able to identify a satisfactory means of assessing student learning. When writing the summary, one student had an unsatisfactory analysis of perceptions for implementing the model and two students failed to provide student perceptions for their models. The area that caused the most problems for this section was providing suggestions for modifications with future use with four of the students performing below an acceptable level of performance. When considered as an entity, all students were able to satisfactorily complete the comprehensive sections of this project. However, some of the sub sections should be addressed to improve overall quality of student performance.
Assessment of teaching
In several assessed areas at least one student was rated as "Not met": Knowledge of growth and development, Communicative skills, Use of class time, Instruction, Evaluation of students, Self evaluation, Planning/preparation, Teacher/Student interaction in class, and Class climate. While the number of areas is substantial, in most areas it was only one student who did not meet the standard; and it was almost always the same student. In the future the course instructor will conduct more formative assessments during the course, to identify students who are not meeting this standard at those times. Additional monitoring and interaction with the instructor will be planned for those students, as needed.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Teaching experience
- **Outcome/Objective**: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching

Implementation Description: This plan will start with the next offering of this course and continue indefinitely.

Summary of 2008-2009 Assessment data
Using the selected assessments in 2008-2009, it was determined from the Faculty end-of-program ratings that 100% of all students were meeting each of the five NBPTS Standards. The data were essentially the same for the 2007-2008 program completers, indicating consistency over time. Nonetheless, the HPE graduate faculty have begun discussions to revise the major research project in the program, away from the Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to participation in ongoing faculty research efforts. Those discussions will proceed through the 2009-2010 academic year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We have already had meetings to discuss revising the major research project in the program, from the Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to ongoing assistance with faculty research efforts.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The HPE Graduate faculty have begun to discuss a revision of the major research project in the program, from Collaborative Action Research (CAR) Project, to a research synthesis of an area selected by each student. The purpose of this change is to provide students with a broader scope of relevant research knowledge than might be achieved through a focused action research project.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data from 2008-2009 show that nearly all students meet nearly all performance standards. However, there is a need to conduct more formative assessments in courses that address standards in unit planning, lesson planning, and assessment of learners, so that students who are not meeting those standards can receive additional help during the course.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We will continue to monitor student achievement within the approved assessment plan, while looking for ways to improve the delivery of some courses. For instance, KH 7820 is being offered as an on-line course in the fall of 2009--allowing for more individual attention to students as they learn the research literature in HPE.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The data from the last two years indicates that nearly all students meet all five standards in the program. We see no need to alter administrative procedures at this time, based on those two years of consistently strong data.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Our future planning will focus on making the program more attractive to more metro area teachers. Toward that goal, we have designed a hybrid program that we hope will be in operation for the 2010-2011 AY. The hybrid program will be delivered with a combination of on-line courses in fall and spring terms, and workshop-type courses in the summer.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vision of the Institute of Health Administration (IHA) within the J. Mack Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University is to be a premier master’s level educator of future healthcare/business leaders. The flagship double degree MBA/MHA program is accredited by the AACSB and CAHME (The Commision on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education), the MBA is ranked 7th and MHA is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWSWR, 2009). The mission 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: GPA of each HA student</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA of each HA student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Percent CAHME educational content provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent CAHME educational content areas provided in specified courses and administrative residencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Student evaluation of HA program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation of HA program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of residents by HA faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Student assessment of residency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment of residency experience/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance of competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During AY 2010 the HA faculty will be mapping competencies based on the HLA model to specific course content of MHA and MBA courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong> By the start of next academic year, a comprehensive mapping of all HLA-based competencies will be...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Description:
By the start of next academic year, a comprehensive mapping of all HLA-based competencies will be mapped to all MHA and MBA courses.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Pat Ketsche, Dr. Andy Sumner, and all other HA faculty/staff

Faculty referred to Center for Teaching and Learning
Faculty member was referred to Center for Teaching and Learning for improvement. The faculty totally revised the course, changed texts and course format.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009

Responsible Person/Group: Chair

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our HA Institute will be developing and implementing a competency-based model which is required by our accrediting body - The Commission on Accreditation of Health Management Education. We will be mapping our courses and modules into the model identified below. The competency model involves the following Domains and competency areas:

Domain#1: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment

We need to identify the appropriate level of mastery to target for each area: 1. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate a minimal skill level or knowledge base in this area 2. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate a moderate skill level or knowledge base in this area 3. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate an extensive skill level or knowledge base in this area.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

HA8700 Health Services Research & Evaluation (Data Mining) was made a required course. This was based on feedback assessment that our students needed more critical thinking skills on data analysis and quality, in particular. HA8630 Managed Care and Planning was moved to an elective course (from a required course) since this content has not been as critical to the field. The content of HA8620 Operations Management in Healthcare was overhauled to focus more on healthcare (not business) problems/exercises. Also, the textbook was changed. This was based on student evaluation feedback.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on feedback from our administrative residents and preceptors, our business-based AND healthcare management curriculum is highly rated, but we continue to improve the focus on critical thinking skills of our students. The curricular changes identified in Q#1 were implemented. In addition, we obtained approval from our RCB Graduate Program Council to make our required curriculum more flexible to meet the needs of a variety of our students. The HA faculty now have approval to approve a specific program of study for each student.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care organizations.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
Critical Thinking
Contemporary Issues
Quantitative Skills
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
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
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Knowledge of the healthcare environment (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 This relates to the 1st domain of the HLA competency model

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Business skills and knowledge (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 This relates to the 2nd domain of the HLA competency model

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 This is the 3rd domain of the HLA competency model

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 5: Develop leadership knowledge and skills (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 This is the 4th domain of the HLA competency model

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience
### SLO 6: Develop real world experience in the HA field (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 One of only 6 CAHME accredited programs in the U.S. providing healthcare management administrative residency program.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication  
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

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: GPA of each HA student (O: 1)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 GPA of each HA graduate student Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

95% of students in each HA graduate degree program should meet the GPA requirement of 3.0.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of Fall 2007 - Summer 2009 shows that 96 percent of HA students meet this goal.

#### M 2: % CAHME educational content areas provided (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 % CAHME educational content areas provided specified courses and administrative residency.  
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Target for O1:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

100% CAHME educational content areas provided

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 April 2007 accredited for 6 years, validating all content areas provided

#### M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Electronic Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance ratings for all HA instructors; specifically items #35 (course effectiveness), 34, 9, and 25.  
Source of Evidence: Client satisfaction survey (student, faculty)

**Target for O1:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

CAHME should accredit all instructors. 90% of HA sections should receive overall rating of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale is the desired rating.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 CAHME assessed all instructors with April 2007 6 year accreditation. Fall 2007 shows that 90 percent of all sections had rating of 4.0.

#### M 4: student evaluation of H.A. program (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 student evaluation of H.A. program during residency, capstone course, and ongoing feedback  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas

90 percent of students should rate HA program 4.0 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Review of Fall 2007-Summer 2009 shows that 90+ percent of students rated content areas at 4.0

#### M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas during residency  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Target for O1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas**

90 percent of preceptors should rate each content area a 4.0 on a rating scale of 5.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of Fall 2007-Summer 2009 shows 95 percent of content areas were rated 4.0+ by preceptors.

**M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O6: Develop real world experience in the HA field**

Preceptors should rate 90% of students at 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of Fall 2007-Summer 2009 shows 95 percent of residents were rated 4.0 of 5.0.

**M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 6)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of residents by HA faculty during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O6: Develop real world experience in the HA field**

95 percent of students should be rated "satisfactory" or better in residency courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Assessment of Fall 2007-Summer 2009 shows that 100 percent of residents were rated Satisfactory.

**M 9: Capstone questions (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students answer specified summative questions in capstone HA 8990 course

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

#### Administrative residency and field study

The two semester health care management residency facilitates the transition from the classroom to the workplace by providing students with an entry point and extensive exposure to a health care management career. The full-time, off-campus residency assures that all graduates have an integrated experience that applies didactic knowledge in a real world health care setting.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

#### Curriculum improvements and competencies

CAHME accreditation is requiring that all HA programs be competency based. The Institute is in the process of selecting a base competency model, modifying where appropriate, mapping the curriculum content areas to the competencies, and evaluating the measures to assess attainment of the competencies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Business skills and knowledge
- Measure: Develop leadership knowledge and skills | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Knowledge of the healthcare environment | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Develop real world experience in the HA field | Outcome/Objective: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
- Measure: Assessment of residents by HA faculty | Outcome/Objective: Develop real world experience in the HA field
- Measure: Capstone questions | Outcome/Objective: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: GPA of each HA student | Outcome/Objective: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Business skills and knowledge
Marketing of MHA and MSHA program

Many potential students are not aware of HA area of study, including many that are in the MBA, PMBA and MS programs at GSU.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the healthcare environment
  - Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the healthcare environment
  - Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the healthcare environment
  - Measure: Student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the healthcare environment

- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Summer and Dr. Pat Ketsche
- Implementation Description: Development and implementation of CAHME competencies requires much additional faculty effort.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our HA Institute will be developing and implementing a competency-based model which is required by our accrediting body - The Commission on Accreditation of Health Management Education. We will be mapping our courses and modules into the model identified below. The competency model involves the following Domains and competency areas: Domain#1: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment Competency areas: Financial Management, Information Systems Management, Strategic Planning and Marketing, Information Based Decision Making, Measuring and improving performance, Organizational Design, Human Resources Domain#2: Knowledge of the Health Care Environment Competency areas: Health Care Industry, Legal and Regulatory Environment, Health Care Financing, Governance, Health Policy, Managerial Ethics and Values, Community and External Relations, Quality Assessment and Improvement, Health Care Technologies Domain#3: Leadership Competency areas: Communication, Oral and Written, Motivating and Empowering others, Group Participation and Leadership, Change Management Domain#4: Professionalism Competency areas: Self Awareness and Self Confidence, Self Regulation and Personal Responsibility, Social Interactions, Time Management, Honesty and Integrity, Public Service, Life Long Learning. We need to identify the appropriate level of mastery to target for each area: 1. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate a minimal skill level or knowledge base in this area 2. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate a moderate skill level or knowledge base in this area 3. Students are expected to develop and demonstrate an extensive skill level or knowledge base in this area.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

HA8700 Health Services Research & Evaluation (Data Mining) was made a required course. This was based on feedback assessment that our students needed more critical thinking skills on data analysis and quality, in particular. HA8630 Managed Care and Planning was moved to an elective course (from a required course) since this content has not been as critical to the field. The content of HA8620 Operations Management in Healthcare was overhauled to focus more on healthcare (not business) problems/exercises. Also, the text was changed. This was based on student evaluation feedback.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on feedback from our administrative residents and preceptors, our business-based AND healthcare mgmt curriculum is highly rated, but we continue to focus the context on critical thinking skills of our students. The curricular changes identified in Q#1 were implemented. In addition, we obtained approval from our RCB Graduate Program Council to make our required curriculum more flexible to meet the needs of a variety of our students. The HA faculty now have approval to approve a specific program of study for each student.
Goals

G 1: Conduct research
The M.S. prepares graduates to formulate research questions, organize and test research problems, and evaluate research study results. This preparation includes a research sequence (HHS 6000 and NUTR 6101) followed by thesis research for about 1/3 of graduate students. The other students complete an electronic portfolio in preparation for their professional careers. Graduate courses are research-based and focus on evidence-based practice.

G 2: Critical thinking and professional leadership
The M.S. fosters critical thinking, inquiry, and professional leadership.

G 3: Advanced discipline content
The M.S. provides graduates with advanced study in nutrition through a core of courses, including NJTR 6101, NJTR 6102, NUTR 6104, NUTR 6105, NUTR 6106, and NJTR 7101.

G 4: Career development
The M.S. enhances career development. Students are exposed to dietetics practitioners in various classes. They are encouraged to attend professional meetings in the Atlanta region. Two-thirds of students complete a pre-professional portfolio to help them make career decisions.

G 5: Framework for advanced degree
The M.S. provides the framework for advanced degree study.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research (G: 1, 5) (M: 1)
Students complete a course sequence on research methods: HHS 6000, NUTR 6101. Professional courses model on evidence-based practice and require students to find, evaluate, and interpret research articles.

Institutional Priority Associations

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

SLO 3: Demonstrate communication skills (G: 2, 4, 5) (M: 2)
Discipline-specific writing is required in all core courses. Example of writing assignments include case studies, position papers, practice philosophies, and business plans. Students make presentations in over half of their required courses. These presentations are based on major papers and projects.

SLO 4: Evaluate health policy (G: 2, 4)
Since the M.S. has a professional focus, most students will work in a health care setting. In HHS 8000, NJTR 7101 and NJTR 7950 students evaluate relevant health care policies.

SLO 5: Comprehend nutrient intakes and impact on health (G: 3)
The core content for the M.S. includes nutrient metabolism. This area is the focus of NUTR 6104 and NUTR 6106 and is a component of all other required courses.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Design and evaluate nutrition care plans (G: 2, 4)
Students design and evaluate nutrition care plans in NJTR 7200 and NUTR 7250.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Thesis proposal evaluation (O: 1)
One-third of students complete a thesis. Submitted thesis proposals are reviewed by a division committee using a rubric. The rubric evaluates the following areas on a scale of 0 (unacceptable) to 5 (exemplary): Research hypothesis and objectives clearly stated in the proposal Introduction provides a historical context and literature review of the thesis topic Materials and methods clearly stated, well-conceived, and scientifically accurate Compliance issues, if applicable Writing mechanics Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Design, interpret, and conduct ethical research
The achievement target is a minimum score of 3 (proficient) for each area and an overall mean score of 4 (between proficient and exemplary) across all areas.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Two faculty members had family emergencies during the evaluation session. Evaluation will be completed when they return.

M 2: Portfolio evaluation (O: 3)
Two-thirds of students prepare and present a pre-professional electronic portfolio. These are evaluated by faculty using a rubric with a scale of 0 (unacceptable) to 3 (exemplary) on the following areas: layout, reflections, selection of artifacts, writing mechanics, and following portfolio guidelines.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Demonstrate communication skills**

The achievement target is 2 (proficient) for each area, with an overall mean score of 2.5 (proficient-exemplary) across all areas.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Two faculty members had family emergencies during the evaluation session. Evaluation will be completed when they return.

---
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**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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content and Skills**

The department expects students to develop a scaffolding of knowledge about the past and an aptitude for the critical thinking, research and writing skills of a historian. They should be able to read primary sources and scholarly writing, engage competing interpretations of the past, marshalling evidence to support reasoned arguments, and develop the empathy needed to understand the past. They should also be able to compare national histories and understand transnational developments, cultivating the habits needed to think critically in a global age.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Contemporary Issues in Historical Perspective**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of contemporary issues posed as questions in final exams or other assignments in the survey course that require analysis of the origins and meaning of contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.

Relevant Associations: This is an expression of the department's ongoing commitment to transnational analysis of U.S. and World History, as well as our collective emphasis on race, gender, religion, ethnicity, class, sexuality, and other constructed categories of identity that shape political, economic, social, cultural, legal, diplomatic, and religious history.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 2: Historiography**

Students, knowing that History entails the critical interpretation of data, demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art, literature, psychology, statistics, dependent upon their area of specialization.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective**

The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographic boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 5: Professional Values
Student is able to employ methods of historical research and modes of historical discourse that emphasize high standards of fidelity to evidence, 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

SLO 6: Professional Skills
Student is able to use effectively such resources as the library, archives, and oral interviews. He/she demonstrates computer skills appropriate to the discipline. Student is able to evaluate the relative worth of different types of evidence - (textual, material, media, oral, quantitative, and statistical, and visual); to exchange information and ideas and present arguments persuasively; to evaluate and critique different historical perspectives and explanations within a conversational setting; to listen and learn from others; and to write clearly, economically, imaginatively and persuasively about facts, issues, and interpretations. The student is able to document sources properly.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

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

Adopt pilot assessment
Upon completion and analysis of fall pilot assessment, make adaptations needed to the rubric. With the adapted rubric gather a full range of data on student critical thinking skills in History for the spring semester 2010.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Early Fall semester meeting
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
- Responsible Person Group: Freshmen Studies Committee (supervises core survey courses)

Designate new skills to measure 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: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
- Responsible Person Group: Freshmen Studies Committee
establish a rubric
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: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
- 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: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department has discussed the assessment issue briefly in the Freshmen Studies Committee. However, due to personnel changes within both the committee and the department this year, no action was taken on altering the methods used to prepare last year’s report. This is a priority topic that will be addressed in the reorganized committee at the beginning of the Fall 09 session.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The committee and the department will be discussing and making decisions about assessment in the context of newly hired personnel, new committee assignments, and the ongoing re-evaluation of the role of non-tenure-track faculty (Lecturers) in teaching the core courses. The fall 09 session will be a good time to make the changes that were initially envisioned in last year’s action plan.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

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

Mission / Purpose
Description: 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. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2009-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 1: Professional Skills (M: 1)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 2: Historiography (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student, knowing that history is the interpretation of data, can demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student knows how to appreciate, critique, and use material from other fields such as geography, economics, history of art, literature, psychology, philosophy, and statistics, dependent upon their area of specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 5: Professional Values (M: 1)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: capstone course seminar paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Professional Skills**

Our target is that all our graduating history students demonstrate mastery of professional skills: that they know to use the library and a computer; that they are able to evaluate the relative worth of different types of evidence; that they can communicate their ideas persuasively and clearly; that they can evaluate and critique different historical perspectives; and that they know how to document sources properly.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the eighteen papers we read, nine met our goal for mastery of professional skills; 5 exceeded our goal; and four did not meet the level required by our standards. Thus fourteen of the papers demonstrated mastery of these professional skills including sophisticated uses of various kinds of source materials. The committee found that while we are doing a good job of teaching these skills, we need to work harder to ensure that all our students master these professional skills.

**Target for O2: Historiography**

Our target is to make sure that all our graduating seniors recognize and can explain the various historical interpretations revolving around a particular event. Their senior papers should include at least some reference to these debates to demonstrate an awareness of historiography.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the eighteen papers examined by the undergraduate studies committee, we found that twelve included some reference to the historiography on their topics, while six included no such discussion. Two of the papers included lengthy and sophisticated historiographical discussions, and ten incorporated at least some references to previous interpretations of their topics. Thus two-thirds of our students are meeting this target, while one-third gave no indication that they recognized that history involves the interpretation of data.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

Our target is for our graduating seniors to demonstrate interdisciplinary awareness and that they can use material from other fields to assist them in their historical analysis.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the eighteen papers examined by the undergraduate studies department, we found that all but two demonstrated some interdisciplinary awareness by building their analysis on approaches that come out of fields other than history, including
literature, the arts, legal studies, statistics, and economics.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective**

Our target in this area is for our graduating seniors to be able to include some kind of comparative analysis in their papers. This comparison to pertain to cultural/geographical boundaries, or to temporal or spatial dimensions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the eighteen papers we read, we found that thirteen met or excelled our goal of having our students demonstrate their ability to include a comparative dimension to their analysis. Several papers treated explicitly transnational or global topics; others included cross-cultural encounters in a given location; many treated change over time. Five papers did not include any analysis that could be defined as comparative.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**

Our target is for our students to be able to employ high standards of fidelity to evidence, tolerance of alternative approaches, and appreciation of work of others.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the eighteen papers the undergraduate studies committee examined, we found that four demonstrated very high levels of these professional values, nine had acceptably high levels, and five did not meet our standards for professional values.

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

**comparative/global/transnational**

The majority of our student papers performed well in this area. Those that did not treated topics that made comparision difficult. We plan to circulate our department’s standards to remind students and faculty that this is one of our defined goals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** capstone course seminar paper
- **Outcome/Objective:** Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Historiography**

We plan to do more to emphasize historiographical debates in our upper-division courses. Students learn about historiography in HIST 3000, Introduction to Historical Studies. Many of the intervening courses drop the issue of historiography to a large extent. We hope that by assigning more short research-type assignments in our upper-division courses, our students will become more comfortable with talking about historiographical debates in their seminar papers. We have also changed to pre-requisites for HIST 4990, our capstone course, to require at least two 4000-level classes prior to enrolling in the class. By ensuring that all our majors get some experience doing research and writing about historiography in our 4000-level classes, we hope that their performance will improve in 4990.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** capstone course seminar paper
- **Outcome/Objective:** Historiography

**Implementation Description:** We have already submitted the proposal to change the prerequisites for 4990 in the course catalog, and the department agreed with the idea of working on emphasizing research skills and historiography in our upper-division courses.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Interdisciplinary Awareness**

We seem to be doing quite well in terms of interdisciplinary awareness as all but two of our sample group satisfied the criteria. We continue to emphasize different disciplines and their impact on history in HIST 3000.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** capstone course seminar paper
- **Outcome/Objective:** Interdisciplinary Awareness

**Professional Skills**

To improve our students’ level of preparedness for the capstone seminar paper, we have agreed as a department to do more to emphasize research skills in our upper-division courses. We will be organizing a pedagogy workshop on research and writing assignments for these classes later this semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** capstone course seminar paper
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson
Professional Values

We hope that the changes described under in action plan for the "historiography" outcome will have a similar effect in this area. We are going to emphasize more research-type assignments in our 4000-level classes so as to give students more research and writing experience in the classes that lead up to 4990. This experience should help them to develop the skills and values described here. The faculty have agreed to attend a workshop on research assignments during the upcoming semester.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are organizing a pedagogical session on teaching 4990, and plan to promote a portfolio approach which seems to work well. The students do peer review sessions and submit all their work, including their comments on other students' papers and the comments they received from other students in the portfolio.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We made two significant changes based on our findings. We modified the prerequisites for HIST 4990, our capstone course. Until recently the prerequisites were listed as four upper-level classes. Now we continue to require that number, but we have added the specification that at least two of these must be at the 4000-level. The second change we introduced was to encourage our faculty who teach 4000-level courses to ensure that students in those classes are doing some research. We hope that by introducing students to research earlier, and by making sure that students take those courses that make them do research, that they will arrive in 4990 better prepared to hit the ground running.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our faculty have agreed to work toward the goal of getting our students to do research in our 4000-level classes. Though not all topics lend themselves to research projects, most of our students will do some work in primary sources and gain some notion of historiography through their upper-level classes.

Georgia State University
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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.

Goals

G 1: Prepare student to research, write and teach history

G 2: Assist students in becoming active, interdisciplinary learners

G 3: Academic Honesty
Nurture in students the qualities of honesty and accuracy.

**G 4: Global Perspective**
Help students understand the links between history and the larger world

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Professional Skills (M: 1)**
The student demonstrates skills essential to conducting and presenting historical research, including techniques and methods of archival/primary material research, synthesis and analysis of secondary material, as well as organization and historical argumentation.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Histiography**
The student shows awareness of existing arguments and historical literature – empirical, methodological, and theoretical – pertaining to a specific project or problem of historical research.

**O/O 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**
The student is aware of the relations between historical research/writing and work in the other disciplines, especially those in the humanities and social sciences, and is able to employ theories and methods from these disciplines where appropriate to enrich historical research/writing.

**O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives**
The student can situate historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.

**O/O 5: Professional Values**
Students must become aware of and internalize professional standards for research, argumentation, and use of secondary works. This involves, among other questions, defining and recognizing plagiarism and the unattributed use of the work of colleagues and students.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assessment Instrument (O: 1)**
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

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

**General Examinations**
During academic year 2009-2010 elements of the rubric/instrument will be applied to all general examination at the completion of MA coursework.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring 2010 semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Rubric Testing**
During academic year 2009 – 2010 the Department will carry out a “beta” run to test the rubric/instrument. It will be applied at the mid-point and end of History 8000 (Historical Methodology - renumbered 7000 under the reforms) and History 8890 (Special Topics) which will be a preliminary version of what will become History 7060 (Research Seminar).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The end of Spring semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty members who will teach respective courses

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement? In addition to implementing the new assessment instrument in seminars it will also be applied to MA comprehensive examinations on a test basis.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?  
Why were these changes made?  
What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  

The History Department has implemented a new assessment instrument. During Fall semester, 2009 this will be utilized in one seminar – the basic graduate level methods course, History 8000. In the Spring semester, 2010 it will be introduced into two seminars including the newly required research seminar History 7060. The Graduate Committee will evaluate the results of these preliminary efforts, make any changes needed, and apply it more broadly in Fall, 2010.  

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:  
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data?  
(In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?)  
If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  

During the Spring semester, 2009 the Graduate Committee made the decision that the existing instruments used to assess our graduate seminars was inadequate to the new assessment requirements. As a result the Committee developed a new assessment rubric and a new assessment instrument.  

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:  
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)?  
How have those changes affected your outcome?  

The Department is applying a new assessment instrument for graduate level courses and examinations beginning Fall semester, 2009. The Graduate Committee expects to use the material gathered from these to recommend new assessment strategies.  

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:  
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department?  
What are the implications?  
How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?  

We expect that the new assessment instruments and procedures will give us much better and more comparable information on the preparation of our students in the area outlined in “Outcomes/Objectives.” This is particularly important because the Department has implemented a complete overhaul of the PhD program that will go into effect Fall semester, 2010 coincident with the broad implementation of the new assessment instrument.  

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:  
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year?  What degree of improvement do you anticipate?  

Once the new assessment instrument has been tested and the results assessed the History Department will be better positioned to understand what may be the necessary next steps in carrying assessment forward. It would be premature at this point to anticipate results.  

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
- Constructing new assessment rubric and implementing new assessment instrument

**Challenges for Next Year**
- Revise assessment rubric and assessment instrument based on results of first implementation

**Contributions to Student Retention**
- Implementing new PhD program intended to streamline the program and facilitate graduation

---

**Georgia State University**
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(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 PhD level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involves not only the mechanics of research, teaching, and writing but developing such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the student 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 graduate History program are prepared not only to be competent historians and teachers but also to function successfully in the larger community, both within and outside the academy.

**Goals**

**G 1: Prepare students to research, write and teach history**

**G 2: Learning**

Assist students in becoming active, interdisciplinary learners
### G 3: Academic Honesty and Integrity
Nuture in students the qualities of honesty and accuracy

### G 4: Global Perspective
Help students understand the links between history and the larger world

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Professional Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates skills essential to conducting and presenting historical research, including techniques and methods of archival/primary material research, synthesis and analysis of secondary material, as well as organization and historical argumentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Historiography (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student shows awareness of existing arguments and historical literature – empirical, methodological, and theoretical – pertaining to a specific project or problem of historical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student is aware of the relations between historical research/writing and work in the other disciplines, especially those in the humanities and social sciences, and is able to employ theories and methods from these disciplines where appropriate to enrich historical research/writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can situate historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Professional Values (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must become aware of and internalize professional standards for research, argumentation, and use of secondary works. This involves, among other questions, defining and recognizing plagiarism and the unattributed use of the work of colleagues and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Me 1: Graduate Assessment Instrument (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A rubric that was designed to assess a student's skill set in two core courses of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**General Examinations**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The end of Spring semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program committee

**Rubric Testing**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The end of Spring semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Committee

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

In addition to implementing the new assessment instrument in seminars it will also be applied to MA and PhD comprehensive examinations on a test basis.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the
coming academic year?
The History Department has implemented a new assessment instrument. During Fall semester, 2009 this will be utilized in one seminar – the basic graduate level methods course, History 8000. In the Spring semester, 2010 it will be introduced into two seminars including the newly required research seminar History 7060. The Graduate Committee will evaluate the results of these preliminary efforts, make any changes needed, and apply it more broadly in Fall, 2010.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

During the Spring semester, 2009 the Graduate Committee made the decision that the existing instruments used to assess our graduate seminars was inadequate to the new assessment requirements. As a result the Committee developed a new assessment rubric and a new assessment instrument.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The Department is applying a new assessment instrument for graduate level courses and examinations beginning Fall semester, 2009. The Graduate Committee expects to use the material gathered from these to recommend new assessment strategies.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

We expect that the new assessment instruments and procedures will give us much better and more comparable information on the preparation of our students in the area outlined in “Outcomes/Objectives.” This is particularly important because the Department has implemented a complete overhaul of the PhD program that will go into effect Fall semester, 2010 coincident with the broad implementation of the new assessment instrument.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Once the new assessment instrument has been tested and the results assessed the History Department will be better positioned to understand what may be the necessary next steps in carrying assessment forward. It would be premature at this point to anticipate results.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

Constructing new assessment rubric and implementing new assessment instrument

**Challenges for Next Year**

Revise assessment rubric and assessment instrument based on results of first implementation

**Contributions to Student Retention**

Implementing new PhD program intended to streamline the program and facilitate graduation

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Hospitality Administration BBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:35 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Cecil B. Day School of Hospitality Administration is committed to academic excellence in the development of students for leadership roles in the hospitality industry. We prepare students by pursuing ethical, innovative and value-enhancing strategies in a culturally diverse and technologically advanced world. We serve our local, national and international constituencies through research, teaching and outreach activities. The School achieves its mission by offering a relevant, up-to-date curriculum in a teaching and learning environment that emphasizes continuous improvement. The School of Hospitality is located in the Robinson College of Business. There are about 320 majors in the School.

**Goals**

**G 1: Students will be knowledgeable of the major industry segments.**

Hospitality students will be knowledgeable of the major industry segments including hotels, restaurants, foodservice, venues, convention/conference centers, airports, airlines, convention and visitor bureaus, clubs (golf, country, city), event planning and tradeshow operations. They will have basic information on two additional segments including casino operations and cruise line operations. This understanding will also include understanding how the industry segments interact with one another for seamless service and optimized business results.

**G 2: Students will be prepared with business knowledge and service skills.**
Hospitality students will have the business knowledge and service skills to optimize the success of companies and corporations.

G 4: Students will develop the analytical skills to evaluate the business environment of today and the future. Hospitality students, in being provided with the skills to analyze the business environment, will be able to evaluate and assess what is needed for success in the organization today and in the future.

G 5: Students will become ethical thinkers. Hospitality students will understand the importance of ethical behavior, be aware of ethical dilemmas in the industry and know how to proactively prevent ethical problems personally and with their work force.

G 6: Students will develop knowledge of sustainable business practices and implementation processes. Hospitality students will become knowledgeable of sustainable business practices in being environmentally aware and will understand the processes necessary for the implementation of these proactive measures.

G 7: Students will be prepared for management and leadership positions in the hospitality industry. Hospitality students will develop effective leadership skills and managerial capabilities to be effective in the workplace of hospitality businesses.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to explain the different segments of the hospitality industry and explain how these segments work together to the benefit of internal and external guests and customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Explain and evaluate the application of foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to define foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Explain and analyze the application of human resource principles in a hospitality business operation (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Explain and analyze the application of service marketing theories (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to evaluate, analyze and determine how to apply service marketing theories and principles in promoting primarily intangible products in hospitality businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Explain and analyze the application of laws and regulations in hospitality businesses (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of various facets of hospitality law aimed at minimizing liabilities in hospitality operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply concepts and principles of financial analysis including cost control techniques and evaluate financial business outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Develop industry-specific specializations. (M: 8, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through the hospitality elective courses, students will develop specializations in industry-specific areas such as hotel management, restaurant management, event planning, tradeshows and meeting management, club management, venue management, airline and airport management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Hospitality work experience (M: 3, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate professional work behaviors and an application of necessary knowledge and skills in preparing to enter management-level positions in the hospitality industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Demonstrate sound general business foundation (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This objective relates to hospitality majors demonstrating retention of knowledge from the business foundation courses and the junior business core courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Projects (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most hospitality courses use individual and group projects to assess understanding of industry terminology, principles and processes and application in real-life hospitality businesses. Projects that are undertaken for actual hospitality companies have consistently used in several courses. Examples include the following: Hospitality Service Marketing (HADM 3760) has completed marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments**

The target is for 100% of hospitality students to know the segments of the industry and to also understand how they relate, interact and partner. Courses incorporating projects related to this learning objective: HADM 3010 (required); HADM 4800 (required)

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Based on feedback from faculty, approximately 98% of hospitality majors understand the industry segments and how these segments interrelate. This was demonstrated through projects with outcomes of 95% or higher regarding this objective. As faculty, we need to put more attention on less well-know segments of the industry such as destination management and tourism and incorporate these topics into the projects.

**Target for O2: Explain and evaluate the application of foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques**

A required project for the Food Productive and Foodservice Management course (HADM 3401/3402) if to prepare and serve an actual event. For this past year, this included a dinner for approximately sixty people honoring several of our industry contributors (fall 2008) and a reception for approximately 80 people honoring graduating seniors. The goal of these events is to have 100% of the students be able to perform all (100%) of their assigned tasks thereby showing an understanding of the application of foodservice and production terms and concepts.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Both events were accomplished with all students demonstrating knowledge and skills in completing all assigned tasks.

**Target for O3: Explain and analyze the application of human resource principles in a hospitality business operation**

HADM 3750, Hospitality Human Resources, utilizes several case-based projects as well as developing a written resource book of human resource applications (job analysis, job description, interview questions, training guide, performance evaluation format).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Based on the course sections offered in 2008-2009, 90% of the students demonstrated an acceptable level of understanding of the involved HR principles meaning that students achieved an 85% or higher grade on the combined assignments.

**Target for O4: Explain and analyze the application of service marketing theories**

HADM 3760, Hospitality Service Marketing, includes projects (many of which are for actual companies) in which marketing plans are developed or in which marketing plans are critiqued, analyzed and revised. The goal is for 100% of the hospitality majors to demonstrate understanding of marketing theories through this application.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Based on the assignment grades for fall 2008 and spring 2009, 95 - 98% of the majors did demonstrate an acceptable level of understanding (minimum 85% or higher in applying theories).

**Target for O5: Explain and analyze the application of laws and regulations in hospitality businesses**

The Hospitality Law courses include a project involving an audit of an actual hospitality operation for potential legal liabilities. This is a group project with the students visiting the business for a walk-through of front-of-the-house and back-of-the-house operations.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

For the four hospitality courses offered during the 2008-2009 academic year, 100% of the students successfully completed this project. The average grade was in the B+ range. The content of the papers was very good and showed a sound understanding of the objective. Points were typically lost for writing skills and/or the paper not being specific in detail.

**Target for O6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations**

The Hospitality Strategic Management course uses a written project in which students work individually in writing a strategic career plan. The sections are the same as with a business strategic plan but focused on the individual's career goals.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The average grade on this project was 89 and 92 for fall and spring respectively. The goal was to achieve a minimum of 85 points.

**M 2: Expanding types of written exams (O: 3, 6)**

Most hospitality courses do utilize written exams. To access learning rather than short-term memorization, an increasing number of hospitality courses are using questions that present real-life situational questions. The tests, therefore, present opportunities for assessing critical thinking. These testing changes initially were made in HADM 4800, Hospitality Strategic Management, a CTW course and to a lesser extent (i.e. not all exam questions but approximately 1/3), HADM 3750, Hospitality Human Resources.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Explain and analyze the application of human resource principles in a hospitality business operation**
The Achievement Target was for at least 90% of the students in the HADM 3750 (Hospitality Human Resources) to achieve at least 85% of the available points on the situational, expanded test items demonstrating an understanding of the application of HR principles.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Although there was some variance between the course sections, 93% of the students successfully completed the piloted test format which included six to ten situational questions targeting HR principles.

**Target for O6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations**

The expansion of written exams included providing situational questions that required the application of course content. These were essay-type questions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students passed the exams using this approach although the grades ranged from low 70s to high 90s. To earn the maximum number of points, students had to both know the content, be able to apply the content correctly to the provided situation and be able to communicate their selected strategic action effectively in writing. While most students (over 95%) knew the content, about 90% were able to effectively apply it and approximately 10% of the 90% lost points because of not being able to effectively communicate their decisions in writing.

**M 3: Work Experience Portfolio (O: 9)**

Hospitality majors are required to work a minimum of 750 hours in the industry prior to graduation. The Work Experience Portfolio is an in-depth analysis of this work experience. It requires for the student to evaluate key business components (service levels - internal and external; human resource approaches - dealing with diversity, optimizing employee satisfaction and effective teamwork; financial results - potential areas for growth, areas of waste, pricing structure; strategic principles - clear mission, goals and objectives and responding to the environmental changes.) In addition to evaluating the work experience, students are asked to make recommendations for improvement (analysis and application of knowledge). For 2008-2009, the topic of sustainability was added to the work portfolio in order to address green operational practices and what the business could be doing.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O9: Hospitality work experience**

Students must successfully complete the Work Experience Portfolio with an 85% minimum grade (out of 100 points.)

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All hospitality majors successfully completed the Work Experience Portfolio with a minimum score of 85.

**M 4: Business Computerized Simulation (O: 7)**

HADM 4100 (Hospitality Cost Control and Financial Analysis) utilizes a simulated business experience involving operating a foodservice operation. The simulation incorporates knowledge from all major functional areas - finance, law, human resources, marketing, operations.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O7: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results**

The goal is for 100% of the students to operate the functional areas effectively in order to show profitability. If there are no profits, or less profits compared to the other groups in the class, the goal is for students to apply analytical skills to understand what areas needed improvement and how the improvements could be implemented. This is a group project that assesses results for the team's efforts.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

For the academic year, 85% of the student groups showed profitability. The 15% who did not show profitability in the simulation were able to successfully target needed changes and were able to explain how to implement these changes.

**M 5: RCB ETS Standardized Test (O: 10)**

All BBA majors take the ETS standardized exam in conjunction with BUSA 4980. Feedback is received for subgroups by major. The exam relates to content from the business foundation courses, junior business core as well as content from hospitality courses. The specific sections of the test include: accounting, economics, management, quantitative business analysis, finance, marketing, legal and social environment, information systems, international issues.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O10: Demonstrate sound general business foundation**

The target is comparative regarding the performance of hospitality majors on the ETS test being in line with other business majors. As a total score, hospitality majors should score in the 152 - 157 range.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

The spring 2009 total score on the ETS exam for hospitality majors was 147 as compared to 152 as the next lowest score for business majors (in management and marketing.) Improvement is needed in all categories of the exam.

**M 6: Hospitality Senior Exit Exam**

The Hospitality Senior Exit Exam has been administered to graduating hospitality majors for the last six years. The test was not administered in 2008-2009 because the content is being revised and the format used for questions is changing to more critical-thinking based (application of knowledge) items. The test will resume fall semester 2009.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge
### M 7: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience (O: 9)

All hospitality majors are required to have a minimum of 750 hours of industry experience. Employers submit a written structured evaluation for each student under their supervision. These evaluations are regularly grouped and analyzed in terms of positive and negative feedback.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target for O9: Hospitality work experience**

The goal is to have 100% positive feedback from employers of hospitality students completing their work study requirements.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The feedback from employers of work study students for AY 2008-2009 was 100% positive. Positive is defined as scoring over a 96% on the supervisory evaluation form.

### M 8: Placement and recruiter feedback (O: 8)

The School of Hospitality does monitor placement of graduates including level of positions, employer segments and starting salaries. The School also regularly obtains feedback from recruiters. This is done at the School's fall career fair and at the spring career fair. The feedback is focused on quality of graduates placed in terms of job performance at their respective companies.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target for O8: Develop industry-specific specializations.**

The School offers a variety of industry specializations through numerous hospitality electives. Placement rates (with the goal of 100%) are attempted as well as consistent feedback from recruiters. The goal is to have all hiring companies satisfied with the student/graduate placed.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Placement rates are highest in the hotels, restaurants, private clubs (typically ranging in the high 90s - 95%+) depending on the student/graduate's flexibility. Placement rates are lower (83-85%) in event management and tradeshow/meetings management. Feedback from recruiters is less structured but is positive about the caliber of graduates. Employers state that graduates are well-prepared with relevant knowledge, service skills and prior work experience.

### M 9: Alumni Feedback (O: 8)

The School of Hospitality recently formed an Alumni Club and will be surveying graduates on their accomplishments since graduation as well as comments pertaining to courses preparing them management responsibilities. This is planned for fall 2009 - spring 2010. For this report, the alumni feedback is reported but it is anecdotal.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O8: Develop industry-specific specializations.**

The goal is to have 100% positive alumni feedback.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Alumni feedback, again realizing that at this point it is anecdotal, is positive. Specific feedback from the Alumni Leadership Council has been that the School provides a solid foundation for the different hospitality segments. Regarding overall curriculum, several alums have mentioned that a second language requirement would have been helpful in their careers.

### M 10: ACPHA Accreditation

The School of Hospitality is accredited through the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA). ACPHA requires an annual report reporting activities related to programmatic goals and objectives. Re-accreditation is required every seven years. The School was re-accredited in 2007. The stated learning objectives for the School are consistent with ACPHA's criteria.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

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

**Approval of ACPHA Annual Report**

The School of Hospitality is also accredited by ACPHA (Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration.) The annual report will be submitted by February 2010 which includes a submission of updates on learning objectives and assessment progress. The action step is to submit a comprehensive, up-to-date report to feedback for continual improvement.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: High
- **Projected Completion Date**: 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Debby Cannon

**Coordination among faculty**

Through enhanced faculty communication and coordination, the department will focus on achieving more consistency between sections of the same course taught by different faculty.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: Medium
- **Projected Completion Date**: 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Debby Cannon
Curriculum Review Process
During spring 2010, the hospitality faculty will conduct, at minimum, a one-day meeting to comprehensively review all course content, methods of assessing student learning and a review of specific teaching techniques.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon to facilitate but all faculty would be involved.

Performance on ETS exam
Hospitality courses will be evaluated for including a brief refresher of foundation business courses. Sequencing of courses, involving a review of prerequisites, will also be involved.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: RCB ETS Standardized Test | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate sound general business foundation
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Revision of Senior Exit Exam
The Senior Exit Exam is being updated so that it better reflects the content of required hospitality courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Communication between faculty regarding course content will be facilitated by one-on-one meetings with the school's director in combination with discussions during departmental faculty meetings and meetings among faculty teaching the same courses. The department will also be reviewing approaches used by other departments and other hospitality programs in evaluating major assignments such as group projects in which the class is working with actual operating businesses. These projects have provided excellent learning opportunities for students but more consistency is needed in the evaluation of individual and group performance between projects and between course sections.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Hospitality Senior Exit Exam was evaluated and is in the final stages of being revised. Although passed by over 95% of hospitality majors in 2007-2008, a thorough review was needed since course content changes over time. The new exam is planned to be ready by the end of fall semester 2009 and administration will start at that point. Course content has expanded, particularly in HADM 4800 - Hospitality Strategic Management, to include specific information on sustainable hospitality operations. Since this is a required course and is the capstone course, the material was appropriate for this course. Based on ETS results by hospitality majors, it was evident that required hospitality courses needed to review some of the related business prerequisites to show the application of information from the Business Foundation and Junior Business Core courses.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

One of the biggest needs that became evident from this year’s assessment is the need for more consistency between course sections. The assessment results reflected that course sections are similar in overall content but types of projects, assignments and tests differ. More attention will be given to faculty, teaching different sections of the same course, meeting regularly to discuss how to consistently achieve the designated learning outcomes. The development of consistent evaluation measures will be considered for assignments such as projects in different sections of the same course.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

There have been some minor faculty changes resulting in a better match between faculty and course content. The food production course, now taught by a Chef Instructor, is more focused on integrating content between the lecture portion of the course and the food lab component. Since HADM 4100, Hospitality Financial Analysis and Cost Control, has been more focused on restaurants and foodservice operations, inclusion of hotel quantitative approaches as been added to that course. HADM 4900, the hospitality capstone course, now includes material on sustainability in the hospitality industry which is one of the added programmatic learning objectives. A section on sustainability has also been added to the work portfolio required for HADM 4900.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Overall, the assessment results showed that the department is focused on the identified programmatic objectives and that the course objectives do support the programmatic goals. Operational improvements will include more frequent reviews of the assessment measures (each semester versus annually) with more frequent group input from the faculty. A portion of each departmental faculty meeting will be devoted to discussing assessment issues. Reinstating the senior exit exam will also provide important data regarding student retention and application of information.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Based on input from faculty related to each delineated programmatic objective, some objectives will be refined and better focused. I have met individually with all faculty and their commitment to the assessment processes is very good. Their involvement in some of the planned improvements, such as developing consistent measures between course sections, will be key and I anticipate significant improvements in these areas.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Human Resource Management MS
As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 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.

This Mission Statement was actually established in the 2007-2008 cycle. It did not migrate, however, to the 2008-2009 cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Compensation System Design (M: 1, 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.

SLO 2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment (M: 3, 4)
The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design an accurate, valid, and detailed employee recruitment and selection system that incorporates job analysis, behavioral interviews, work samples, and tests.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Employment Law (M: 5, 6)
The MS-HRM graduate will understand and effectively apply employment law. The student will be able to identify relevant case issues and laws, draw reasonable conclusions, and recommend policies to address the situation.

SLO 4: Employee Relations (M: 7, 8)
The MS-HRM graduate will be able to understand and effectively choose and design performance management techniques that enhance employer productivity and minimize bias.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Inclusion of and appropriateness in MGS 8390 project of strategic alternatives and rationale for various recommended strategies.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Compensation System Design
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected
Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fail to meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 1: Accurate description and usage guides for job analysis, descriptions, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcome: Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0.

M 2: Integration of All Compensation Components (O: 1)
Inclusion, integration, and proper usage in MGS 8390 project of all components of compensation systems, including job evaluation, market wage analysis, pay structures, and compensation budgets.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Compensation System Design
At least 80% of the students scoring higher than 2.0 on the criteria in the Measure 2 Rubric. To be scored from randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 1: Understand and apply job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Fail to meet Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 2: Accurate description and usage guides for dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques. Student can accurately and in detail describe and explain usage of dispute resolution and HR policy formulation techniques.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0.

M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)
In the final project in MGS 8360 students will Normal 0 false false false include a clear explanation of job analysis procedure and resulting job description and job specification.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment
Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Below Standard (1) Meets Standard (2) Exceeds Standard (3) Measure 3: Inclusion and proper usage of job analysis, job descriptions, and job specifications Student uses 2 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, description, and specification) in adequate detail Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system (job analysis, job description, and specification) in inadequate detail Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system in extensive detail

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.5/2.0.

M 4: Behavioral Interview Questions (O: 2)
Normal 0 false false false Inclusion of detailed behavioral interview questions, and related scoring system and administrative guidelines, and work sample and other tests for an employee recruitment and selection system.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 4 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 2: Understand and apply all components of recruitment and selection system Does not meet Standard (1) Meets the Standard (2) Exceeds the Standard (3) Measures 4: Inclusion and proper usage of behavioral interviews, work sample, and selection tests Student designs behavioral interviews or work samples, but not more than 2 selection tests with no validation. Student designs behavioral interviews and work samples, and validation for both. Student designs behavioral interviews, work samples, and additional selection tests with validation for all methods.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/2.0.

M 5: Law Issue Identification (O: 3)
Normal 0 false false false Identification of relevant case issues and laws and expression of reasonable conclusions.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Employment Law
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Standard Not Met (1) Standard Met (2) Standard Exceeded (3) Measure 5: Identification of relevant issues, laws, and reasonable conclusions Incomplete or incorrect identification of issues, laws, or conclusions Complete and correct identification of most issues, laws, and conclusions Complete and correct identification of all issues, laws, and conclusions

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/2.0.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Compensation System Design

With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to design comprehensive compensation system, two actions will be taken:  
- In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.  
- In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Integration of All Compensation Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Lucy McClurg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employee Recruitment and Selection

With respect to the second learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively apply all major components into a comprehensive employee recruitment and selection system, two actions will be taken:  
- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise job analysis, job description, and job specification. Evaluate after next offering.  
- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise questions, scoring system, work sample, and other tests. Evaluate after next offering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### M 6: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements (O: 3)

Students will be able to produce appropriate and clearly-written HR policies in response to situations and laws.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 7: Performance Management Concepts (O: 4)

Student will be able to discuss appropriate use of performance management tools and the advantages and disadvantages of each as exhibited in answers to exam questions in MGS 8300.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.5/2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 8: Employee Relations and Productivity (O: 4)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE X-NONE Students will be able to effectively and accurately discuss how usage of performance management and employee relations techniques will enhance employer productivity.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Results of Outcomes: Faculty rating of 1.6/2.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Employment Law
With respect to the third learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively apply employment law, two actions will be taken:
· Add a homework assignment in MGS 8320 for no credit as a practice and learning tool for case analysis. Evaluate after next offering.
· Add an in-class exercise in MGS 8320 requiring students to write policy responses. Discuss and critique in class. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Homework Assignment Changes
Actions to be Taken: Add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design

Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Performance Management
With respect to the fourth learning outcome, the student’s ability to understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques, two actions will be taken:
· Add a 30-minute lecture in MGS 8300 and provide additional supplemental handouts on performance management. Evaluate after next offering.
· Add a homework assignment in MGS 8300 on linking performance management to specific employer productivity measures. Require students to find research results for performance management techniques. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Faculty will review each others' syllabi and assignments to ensure that students have an opportunity in each class to demonstrate mastery of functional HR skills and competence in applying HR research to the practice of HR. These functional skills are explicated in the rubric measures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have better defined the differences in student learning expectations between the MBA and MS programs and between the undergraduate Human Resources (HR) degree and graduate HR degrees. This has required us to focus on the “value added” of the MS degree and how we can achieve that.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We will be adding more HR functional skills to the HR curriculum and spending more class time reinforcing those skills. A particular emphasis in the MS program will be ensuring students can find, interpret, and use HR research in all functional HR areas.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 We have begun to institutionalize the assessment of our
We have begun to institutionalize the assessment of our students using our new rubric measures. We have started to systematically cross-check rubric measures for specific lecture, text, in-class activity, and assignments in each class to ensure we are adequately delivering material to enable students to meet our expectations.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Faculty members have started communicating more effectively with each other as we adjust course content and assess student outcomes. We are more systematically checking that each learning outcome is adequately represented in the content across courses. This has led to more collaboration about teaching certain topics and how coverage will be ensured while decreasing redundancy.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We like to see a 3-4 percentage point increase in the proportion of our students meeting expectations on all measures. We will meet regularly to discuss expectations and outcomes and to review course content and methods of delivery. We will strengthen the areas where students are deficient, even if it means spending more time in class doing remedial work.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Instructional Technology MS**

As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### Mission / Purpose

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

### Goals

**G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16**
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

**G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp**
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate, government and military sectors.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development (G: 1, 2) (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.

### Institutional Priority Associations

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
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. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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. New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4. Technology
6. Graduate Experience
SLO 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design (G: 1, 2) (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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
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. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management (G: 1, 2) (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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
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. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
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. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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. Contribute to the greater community good
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**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience
SLO 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation (G: 1, 2) (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.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.1 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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
2.11 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation 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 Contribute to the greater community good
3.1 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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009** - 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 2008-2009** - Target: Met
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

M 2: 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: End of Course Assessments (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**

95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: 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.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - 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.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to increase enrollment we will continue to expand our online offerings. We will implement our previously approved endorsement program in Online Learning. We have also begun the approval process for offering our MS degree in a fully online format.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have increased our online offerings and recruitment efforts.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

While our current academic program is effective, increasing fiscal pressure coupled with low enrollment has forced us to cancel some classes, resulting in some students facing a delay in finishing the program. We need to increase enrollment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Although not reflected in this report, the majority of our credit hour generation comes through service courses we offer at both the graduate and undergraduate level. We have standardized the way we offer these courses, which has not only improved them, but has also given us more time to focus on our graduate degree programs.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

This year's findings emphasize our need for recruitment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We anticipate reaching an entirely new student base to whom we may not have had access before.
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**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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies**

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

**G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies**

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Understands and uses technology (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

#### SLO 3: 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

#### SLO 4: 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

#### SLO 5: Understands foundations of education (M: 1, 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

#### SLO 6: Develops a professional identity (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

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

#### SLO 7: Develops an extended knowledge base (M: 1, 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

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2: Develops leadership for the profession (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### M 2: 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Document Analysis

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

### M 3: Residency Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students met or exceeded all standards.
**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.
Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for O6: Develops a professional identity
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)
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.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

Target for O4: Engages in scholarship
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)
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.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Target for O4: Engages in scholarship
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We will submit more proposals for external funds.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have standardized our cumulative review process using LiveText. We have recruited more full-time Ph.D. students. We have engaged more students in faculty research.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We need to increase our external funding to support more full-time students. We need to provide for additional faculty professional development. Current travel funds are targeted toward presenting research at professional meetings. We need separate funds strictly for knowledge enhancement.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
We are better able to track outcomes based on our standardization of cumulative review. We expect, but do not yet have data to support it, that student completion rates will improve.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Our department is on pace with the university as it transitions to becoming more research oriented.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We expect to increase our external funding and to engage our students in more research prior to their dissertation work.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 International Business MS
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 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 and/or managerial 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, build capabilities to deal effectively in international markets, extend functional skills to deal with managerial issues in the global marketplace, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, develop intercultural awareness and sensitivity, 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.

Goals
SLO 1: Complete analyses Goal 1 (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Related Measures: I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives Measure 1 Understanding of International Business Environment – Critical Success Factor Analysis Fails to meet standards = 1: The student cannot sufficiently distinguish critical success factors, align major resources with these factors, and construct logical cause-effect relationships. Meets standards = 2. The student can identify most critical success factors, and generally align most factors with firm's major resources. Exceeds standards = 3. The student captures almost all critical success factors, tightly aligns resources with these factors, and effectively compares the firm's position in a thorough manner. Measure 2 Understanding of International Business Environment – Identification of Viable Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot set out clear, viable alternatives for action based on critical success factors in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generate some viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student generates clear and well-supported viable alternatives of action that a grounded in the critical success factors of the environment. Measure 3 Understanding of International Business Environment – Impact on Competitor Actions and Reactions Under the Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot clearly illustrate of explain how a competitive action will be responded to by rival firms in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generally set out the likely competitive responses to strategic moves in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student clearly sets out the impact of the alternatives on the competitors in the environment and incorporates it into the overall analysis and decision.

SLO 2: Complete Analyses Goal 3
Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment. Measure 7 Extend Functional Skills in International Operations Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot sufficiently distinguish between domestic and international contexts. Meets standards=2. The student can demonstrate how to apply knowledge and problem solving. Exceeds standards=3. The student captures almost all functional areas and integrate them. The student can fully capture the implications of four or more functional area decisions.

SLO 3: Complete Analyses Goal 4
I M.8: There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution Or Passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department Or Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB Measure 8 Second Language Proficiency Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Meets standards=2. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department. Exceeds standards=3. The student does a) complete the second language requirement at an institution other than GSU, or b) pass an exam prepared and approved by the GSU IIB department, or c) successfully sit for an examiner approved by the GSU IIB department on their skill level is distinctly higher than that needed for a pass.

SLO 4: Complete Analyses Goal 5
90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria. 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceeds Standards” criteria. Measure 9 * Team Skills Team Assessment Fails to meet standards=1. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student cannot work effectively with others, cannot incorporate functional knowledge, and problem solving. Meets standards=2. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student can apply multiple views and perspectives to create consensus. Exceeds standards=3. In peer evaluation forms it shows that: Student can bring multiple views and perspectives to problem solving and create synergies from diverse perspectives. Measure 10 * Team Skills Faculty Assessment Fails to meet standards=1. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team members: The student has not been an effective member of the team in incorporating knowledge and problem solving. Meets standards=2. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Target Levels Goal 1

90% of students will get 2.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3. 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 1, 2 and 3.

O/O 3: Complete Analyses Goal 2

Related Measures: I M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use. I M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations I M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis Measure 4 Country Market Analysis - Explicit Identification of criteria. Fails to meet standards=1. The student fails to consult reliable data sources and considers trends in less than three macro variables. Meets standards=2. The student identifies and consults two sources for data and analyzes the trends in three macro variables. Exceeds standards=3. The student consults three or more reliable sources for data and analyzes trends in four or more macro variables. Measure 5 Country Market Analysis – Data Interpretation, Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not apply the techniques developed in IB for country market analysis in data interpretation. Meets standards=2. The student generally accesses tools developed in IB in interpreting the data collected for a country market analysis. Exceeds standards=3. The student uses tools developed in IB to develop rich and insightful interpretations of the data collected in a country market analysis. Measure 6 Country Market Analysis – Delineation of different Levels in Analysis Fails to meet standards=1. The student does not effectively distinguish between the different levels of analysis in the country market analysis. Meets standards=2. The student shows an understanding of the different levels of analysis and conducts the country market analysis in that way. Exceeds standards=3. The student can effectively distinguish the different levels of analysis and integrate the different perspectives from each in the country market analysis.

O/O 4: Target Levels Goal 2 (M: 5, 6, 7)

90% of students will get 2.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6. 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measures 4, 5 and 6.

O/O 6: Target Levels Goal 3 (M: 8)

90% of students will get 2.0 on Measure 7. 30% of students will get 3.0 on Measure 7.

O/O 8: Target Levels Goal 4 (M: 9)

80% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their first attempt. 90% of MIB students pass one of the three measures on their second attempt.

O/O 12: Target Levels Goal 6 (M: 12, 13)

90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Pass” criteria. 10% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceed” criteria.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Measures (O: 1)

I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.

M 2: Measure 1 (O: 1)

I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.

M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)

I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 4: Measure 3 (O: 1)**

I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 5: Measure 4 (O: 4)**

I M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 6: Measure 5 (O: 4)**

M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 7: Measure 6 (O: 4)**

I M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 8: Measure 7 (O: 6)**

I M.7: Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 9: Measure 8 (O: 8)**

I M.8: There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution Or Passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department Or Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**M 10: Measure 9 (O: 10)**

I M.9: Team Assessment: Ability to bring multiple views/perspective to problem solving, and demonstrate individual performance when functioning in the team.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**M 11: Measure 10 (O: 10)**

I M.10: Faculty Assessment: Ability to drive towards consensus in the presence of diverse perspectives, and demonstrate that the student has improved the team's performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**M 12: Measure 11 (O: 12)**

I M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 13: Measure 12 (O: 12)**

M.12: Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The implementation of the action plan will be conducted in a sequential manner; development, application, and assessment of results measures of the learning outcomes.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes have been made. The IIB faculty developed the learning outcomes for the MIB program during 2008-09. Assessment will be implemented in the current academic year.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Assessment will be attempted this current year.
**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The faculty has been exposed to the WEAVE online system and is gaining familiarity.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

There were no findings to report.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Major improvement is anticipated in a formal evaluation of learning outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Journalism BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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: Understand law/freedoms of speech/press (M: 1)**
Understand and apply the principles and laws of freedom of speech and press, including the right to dissent, to monitor and criticize power, and to assemble and petition for redress of grievances

**SLO 2: Understand history/role of pro communicators (M: 1)**
Demonstrate an understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications

**SLO 3: Understand diversity relating to communications (M: 1, 2)**
Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications

**SLO 4: Understand theories of communication (M: 1)**
Understand concepts and apply theories in the use of and presentation of images and information

**SLO 5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness (M: 1, 2)**
Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity

**SLO 6: Think critically, creatively, independently (M: 1, 2)**
Think critically, creatively, independently

**SLO 7: Research and evaluate info. (M: 1, 2)**
Conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work

**SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly (M: 1, 2)**
Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve

**SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others’ work (M: 1, 2)**
Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts (M: 1)</strong> Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Apply appropriate tools/technologies (M: 1)</strong> Apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understand law/freedoms of speech/press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire of a sample of recent graduates asked if they met the goal personally and how they were able to meet the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the respondents reported understanding the principles and laws of freedom of speech and press.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understand history/role of pro communicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% or higher of respondents report understanding the history and role of professionals in shaping communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents reported understanding the history and role of professionals in shaping communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Understand diversity relating to communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% or higher of respondents report understanding the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents reported understanding the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Understand theories of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of respondents report demonstrating an understanding of professional ethical principles and working ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents reported demonstrating an understanding of professional ethical principles and working ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of respondents report demonstrating an understanding of professional ethical principles and working ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents reported demonstrating an understanding of professional ethical principles and working ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Think critically, creatively, independently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of respondents report being able to think critically, creatively and independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents report being able to think critically, creatively and independently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Research and evaluate info.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of respondents report being able to conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of respondents reported being able to conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Write correctly and clearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of respondents report being able to write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of respondents reported they were able to write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve.

**Target for O9: Critically evaluate own/others' work**

75% of respondents report being able to critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of respondents reported being able to critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of respondents reported being able to critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness.

**Target for O10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts**

75% of respondents report being able to apply basic numerical and statistical concepts.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

50% of respondents reported being able to apply basic numerical and statistical concepts.

**Target for O11: Apply appropriate tools/technologies**

75% of respondents report being able to apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of respondents reported being able to apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work.

**M 2: rubric (O: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Rubric to score a sample of papers

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Understand diversity relating to communications**

75% or higher of the students' papers written because of an assignment that requires diverse viewpoints score 75% or higher on the diversity rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the student papers written because of an assignment that requires diverse viewpoints scored 75% or higher on the diversity rubric.

**Target for O5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness**

75% or higher of the student papers assigned to write about an ethical aspect score 75% or higher on the ethics rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

82% of the student papers assigned to write about an ethical aspect scored 75% or higher on the ethics rubric.

**Target for O6: Think critically, creatively, independently**

75% or higher of student papers based on reporting and research score 75% or higher on the critical thinking rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

82% of the student papers scored 75% or higher on the critical thinking rubric.

**Target for O7: Research and evaluate info.**

75% or higher of student papers assigned to research and report about a topic scores 75% or higher on the research rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

59% of the student papers scored 75% or higher on the research rubric.

**Target for O8: Write correctly and clearly**

75% or higher of the student papers assigned to write an article using journalism conventions and style score 75% or higher on the writing rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

82% of the student papers scored 75% or higher on the writing rubric.

**Target for O9: Critically evaluate own/others' work**

75% or higher of the students' evaluations of others' work score 75% or higher on the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
76% of the students scored 75% or higher on the evaluation rubric.

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

**CTW**

Adding the CTW capstone course to the Journalism curriculum will allow for additional assessment measures of students’ critical thinking abilities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- *Measure:* self-report
- *Outcome/Objective:* Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness
**Implementation Description:** Beginning of fall semester
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

Adding the CTW course as a capstone to the Journalism curriculum will allow for additional assessment measures of students’ research abilities.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- *Measure:* self-report
- *Outcome/Objective:* Research and evaluate info.
**Implementation Description:** Beginning fall semester
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of the CTW courses to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the critical thinking learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized in the junior-level and capstone courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- *Measure:* rubric
- *Outcome/Objective:* Think critically, creatively, independently
**Implementation Description:** Beginning fall semester
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of the CTW courses--specifically the capstone Media, Ethics & Society course--to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the ethics learning outcome will be emphasized and standardized.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- *Measure:* rubric
- *Outcome/Objective:* Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness
**Implementation Description:** Beginning of fall semester
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** Journalism faculty

**CTW**

With the addition of two CTW courses in the Journalism curriculum next year, additional measures will be easily included, e.g. embedded assignments in the junior-level CTW course.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
embedded assignment
This is the worst assessment result of the Journalism curriculum, and clearly a greater emphasis must be placed on applying basic numerical/statistical concepts. Several embedded assignments in at least two Journalism core courses should be considered to provide better instruction in the use of numbers and statistics by journalists and public relations professionals.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

relationships (measure | outcome/objective):
Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Apply numerical/statistical concepts
Implementation Description: beginning of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
An additional measure is needed to assess the diversity learning outcome. Perhaps an assignment requiring multiple viewpoints should be required in at least one of the Journalism core courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

relationships (measure | outcome/objective):
Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Understand diversity relating to communications
Implementation Description: beginning of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure is needed to assess the history/professional roles learning outcome. The embedded questions on exams in Jour 1000 should be reconsidered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

relationships (measure | outcome/objective):
Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Understand history/role of pro communicators
Implementation Description: Beginning of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure is needed to assess the law/freedoms learning outcome. The embedded questions on exams in Jour 3060 was abandoned this year but a replacement was not devised. Using selected exam questions should be reconsidered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

relationships (measure | outcome/objective):
Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Understand law/freedoms of speech/press
Implementation Description: midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure is needed to assess the theories learning outcome. A rubric to score a sample of student papers written about theory in Jour 3070 was abandoned this year but perhaps should be reconsidered. An assessment exam about theories was abandoned several years ago, but perhaps embedded questions in existing Jour 3070 exams should be considered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

relationships (measure | outcome/objective):
Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Understand theories of communication
Implementation Description: midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

multiple measures
At least one more measure should be added to assess the diversity learning outcome. Perhaps a specific assignment requiring multiple viewpoints to be included should be required in at least one of the core Journalism courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
multiple measures
At least one more measure should be added to assess the evaluation learning outcome. Perhaps a writing style/editing assignment or an embedded exercise about editing on an exam could be used.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: rubric | Outcome/Objective: Critically evaluate own/others’ work
  Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
  Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

revised curriculum
The revised Journalism curriculum has more technology in more courses earlier in the major map than the existing curriculum. The assessment of the use of tools/technology will be much easier as embedded assignments in at least two of the new Journalism core courses will be measured. The curriculum revision will not be fully implemented until AY 2011 so next year will be a transition year, allowing for a pilot study of measures to be tried.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: self-report | Outcome/Objective: Apply appropriate tools/technologies
  Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
  Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The addition of CTW courses requires that all of the Journalism be “trained” on how the courses are structured and assessed. This training is scheduled for prior to the start of the fall semester allowing for a full discussion on the assessment not only of the CTW courses but other courses appropriate to learning outcomes not specifically addressed in the CTW courses. It may be possible to pilot study a few new measures, e.g. embedded assignments, during the fall semester to determine if changes should be made before the new curriculum is fully implemented in fall 2011.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Journalism faculty have approved a major revision of the curriculum and anticipate the final approvals of the new curriculum during fall semester 2009. The new curriculum was motivated by two major items: (1) CTW required courses added to the curriculum beginning fall 2009 and (2) recognition of the changing nature of journalism and public relations industries. These changes prompted a reexamination of the learning outcomes of the Journalism curriculum and the subsequent revision of the curriculum to reflect the new learning outcomes and dynamic changes in industry practices. This year’s assessment report is using the new learning outcomes but the measures of each of the goals is still a work in progress. The CTW courses will expand the measures of assessment but not for all learning outcomes which will require additional consideration for improving the assessment of all learning outcomes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The finding that only half of the Journalism students responding positively to a survey question regarding applying basic numerical/statistical concepts is the worst of all of the curriculum's findings. This will require several assignments in Journalism core courses to address the way numbers and statistics can and should be used in news stories and public relations materials. Another poor performance was noted in the research learning outcome with just over half the students scoring well on the rubric. Their research skills and the reporting about their research should be improved as the students eventually take the CTW capstone course which will require a major research paper of 20-25 pages. As stated in the answer to question #1, the revised Journalism curriculum will be an improvement not only for the students' achievement of the learning outcomes but also in how those achievements will be assessed for this report.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section

2008-2009 Law
As of: 12/13/2008 03:30 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Georgia State University College of Law is committed to providing a high quality legal education in its full time and part time, day and evening programs. In order to fully prepare students for professional lives as practicing attorneys or professionals making other valuable uses of their professional knowledge and skills, the College of Law uses a variety of teaching methodologies, including the case study method, the Socratic method, lectures, seminars, writing workshops, and clinical education. The College of Law seeks to provide an education that is of equal value to graduates who practice law in small, medium and large firms, as well as those who go into government or other public service work. Our education is also intended to be well suited for those graduates who do not practice law at all, but nevertheless work in areas in which their legal education is beneficial. In short, we seek to offer an educational package that is broad and general enough to allow graduates to work in any field, yet also give students the opportunity to learn focus on a specific area of law in their final year of school. The College of Law also seeks to produce students whose knowledge, performance and behavior exemplify the best of the legal profession. In addition to taking classroom courses, students are encouraged to participate in our two live-client clinics, the Tax Clinic and the HeLP Clinic. The Tax Clinic helps clients resolve issues with the IRS. The HeLP Clinic helps clients who come to the clinic with a variety of legal problems related to health problems. The Tax Clinic works closely with the IRS, while the HeLP Clinic works closely with Egleston Hospital and Atlanta Legal Aid. We also encourage students to engage in significant pro bono activities related to skills they develop in the College of Law. Students are also strongly encouraged to participate in our Externship program, in which they receive academic credit for working under close supervision with lawyers in government and public service venues. As of Spring 2009, approximately 675 students are enrolled in our JD program.

Based on prior experience, we expect about 175 to 200 students to earn their J.D.'s by graduating in the Spring. Approximately 20-40 students will typically graduate in the Fall, and about a half dozen to a dozen students graduate in the Summer semester. About 8 to 10 students earn one of six joint degrees each year. The majority of those are in the JD/MBA program.

Since the issuance of the Carnegie Report evaluating legal education in the United States, the College of Law has been undergoing a long-term rigorous review of our entire curriculum. In year one, every member of the College of Law faculty was required to read the entire Carnegie Report and participate in "book club" sessions held on weekend days at faculty members' homes. We also had professors who have created or participated in innovative programs around the country speak to the College of Law faculty about their programs and experiences. In year two, the Faculty Curriculum Committee (including a student representative) was charged with studying our entire curriculum, with an eye to suggesting changes responsive to the Carnegie Report. By the end of the year, the Committee had made a series of findings and ambitious proposals, and presented them to the faculty. In year three, the faculty started the academic year by holding a day-long retreat to consider the Committee's proposals. The retreat, attended by nearly every faculty member, revealed that there were still some wrinkles to be ironed out in the proposals. As a result, significant curricular changes were not approved at the retreat.

Nevertheless, there was a consensus that the faculty was committed to moving forward to making substantial changes in our curriculum, primarily those addressed to students' writing and experiential skills. All agreed that the current required RWA I and RWA II classes do a good job of improving students' writing skills. At the same time, we recognize that many students come into law school with such deficient writing skills that we need far more than two semesters of first year courses to bring them to a "practice-ready" skill level. While there is not universal agreement on this point, many faculty members strongly believe that the 3 hours currently given to the combined RWA courses is too small, for two reasons. First, it simply doesn't allocate enough time and credit to the courses to achieve all we need and hope to achieve in the course. Second, the credit for RWA is so small in proportion to that accorded other classes that it often causes students to spend less effort on the course than is truly required. The sticking point is that an increase in RWA hours, while almost universally supported, will naturally reduce the credit hours accorded to other first year "substantive" courses (Contracts, Property, Torts, Civil Procedure and Criminal Law). Just which courses can or should be reduced in credit hours to accommodate the increase in RWA hours is a matter of continuing debate in the College of Law, as it is in many other American law schools.

Goals

G 1: Legal writing proficiency
Any accredited law school graduate, whether she practices law in a traditional sense or not, needs to be an effective communicator. While oral communication skills often get the most attention in modern American society, the reality is that written communication is more common, more permanent, and more important. For this reason, we seek to produce law graduates who can communicate in clear written form with clients, the courts and the public. Generally, their written communications are intended to perform three distinct functions: (i) identify relevant legal issues; (ii) identify, explain and analyse the existing law dealing with such issues; (iii) predict resolution of the issues by applying the existing facts to the existing law, or propose legal solutions to deal with them in the future.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Writing Intervention exercises (O: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to RWA, all students must also take Civil Procedure I in the Fall and Civil Procedure II in the Spring. Traditionally, these courses have both been tested and graded using one exam at the end of each semester. Especially in Civil Procedure I, the exams have been almost exclusively essay exams. Since Civil Procedure is both required and rather esoteric (especially Civil Procedure I), it seems like a good course to attempt to assess and measure the degree to which students' writing skills are up to par. Picking up on that idea, two Civil Procedure professors first started using a &quot;writing intervention&quot; program throughout the course of the semester to see if such interventions would improve upon the skills already first learned in RWA I. In its first iteration, one professor used the intervention program, while the other did not. So as to make fair comparisons of the results in the two classes, each professor otherwise used the same syllabus and the same final exam. The intervention used in the first (experimental) year and beyond consisted of giving students five three-page, take-home papers, in addition to the final exam. The papers were designed to help students learn how to break a legal rule into its component parts, analyze and apply facts to each of the rule's elements, and make arguments on both sides. Two weeks into the semester, the intervention professor gave her students an initial single issue &quot;practice&quot; paper. After the students turned the paper in, the intervention professor read approximately ten papers to get a sense of the common errors and issues. Before assigning the next paper, she reviewed the IRAC formula (issue, rule, analysis, and conclusion) with the class. She also gave students general feedback on common problems she saw in the papers she read and discussed how to avoid these problems in the future. Since that first experimental year, these methods have been incorporated into that professor's class, and they are being copied by other professors, as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Production of satisfactory written product (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the grading rubric in attached scoring sheets, students' memos are objectively evaluated. They are given multiple opportunities to meet with instructors and write and re-write their papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing**

Our target is to ensure that every single student at the College of Law acquire the proficiency described herein. While that is not possible, our more modest goal is simply to say that students who do not achieve this proficiency will not pass RWA. In fact, there is a significant correlation between those students who do not pass RWA the first time (or at least make a C) and those who do not end up graduating from the College of Law. A significant number of students who are excluded for academic reasons at the end of their first year have either failed or done very poorly in RWA.

**O/O 3: Basic proficiency in oral advocacy**

In the final weeks of RWA II, the objective is to have the students orally present their "advocacy writing" product in a Moot Court competition. This competition, in which all first year students in all sections of RWA II participate against one another, utilizes upper class students, professors, and practicing lawyers to sit as appellate judges and hear the students' presentations. The key to an effective presentation is being able to answer the judges' questions about the problem. Some questions are based solely on the students' written products, but more often they are the judges' original questions intended to probe the depths of students' understanding of the law and gauge the students' appreciation of the consequences of a court ruling for or against their clients.

**O/O 4: Basic proficiency in legal research (M: 2)**

All students must learn the fundamentals of the American legal system. Once they learn these fundamentals, they may choose to "specialize" and take courses in specific areas of the law.

**SLO 1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing (M: 1, 2)**

The primary vehicle via which all students must demonstrate writing proficiency occurs in the required RWA I and II courses. All law students must take and pass these courses in order to graduate; indeed, they must do so in order to take any elective courses. In the Fall (RWA I), the objective is to have the students master the art of "objective writing." Students are first provided with a hypothetical legal scenario and "canned" research, already developed by the entire RWA faculty. Students must first produce a "closed memo," in which they objectively describe the issue, the relevant existing law, and their assessment of how a court would resolve the issue. The hypothetical is a "balanced" one, meaning that there are generally equally good arguments to be made that the relevant law supports one result or the other. The student must learn to identify and effectively present the different possible interpretations of the law, and the varying results at which courts might arrive. The memo is written as if a new law associate is presenting the memo to a senior law firm partner who needs to know whether or not to take on a client's case. In the course of writing their memos, students receive constant feedback, both written and oral, from their RWA instructors. The final product is graded using a highly specific grading rubric.

**SLO 2: Basic proficiency in advocacy writing (M: 2)**

In the Spring (RWA II), the objective is to have the students master the art of "advocacy writing." This differs from RWA in two primary respects. First, the students are no longer able to rely upon "canned research." For this semester, they start with the "canned research," but then learn to supplement it with research of their own. The research skills are those learned in both RWA I and II, and also Legal Bibliography. Legal Bibliography is a course taught by the law librarians in the Fall. Second, the product the students must produce for RWA II is a legal brief. A brief is a document presented to a court for the benefit of one party to a lawsuit. Thus, unlike the memo which is intended to present an objective description of the law, the brief uses the current law to argue for the position of the client the lawyer represents in a lawsuit. Students are assigned to represent one side or the other.

**Source of Evidence: Evaluations**

**Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing**

The goals of these writing intervention exercises are threefold. First, we want all students to become comfortable with practicing writing exercises. While the point of this practice is to succeed on examinations, such practice is good preparation for work as a practicing lawyer. Second, we want students to become comfortable with self-editing, so that they are capable of both writing good quality papers, but also improving upon them the second or later time around. Third, we want all students to write better final
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Encourage professors (both full time and adjunct) to increase the number of writing opportunities students have in all courses. In large required courses where law students typically take just one exam per semester, this will require a major change in practice. We have considered the possibility of linking the RWA courses with substantive courses (Contracts, Property, etc.), so that each student will have at least one substantive course in which all or most of his/her RWA writing assignments would specifically relate to that subject matter. This would require more writing instructors than the College currently employs, and is thus currently unrealistic.

Several professors have begun to employ mid-term examinations and other exercises to help students assess their learning and progress throughout the semester, as well as to gain practice in performing on examinations. Preliminary results of some professors’ efforts tend to show that the students who take advantage of “extra” learning and testing opportunities do indeed progress more in their learning than their colleagues who do not take advantage of such opportunities. The College continues to encourage professors who are engaged in such activities to continue them and to work with other professors in the College to do similar work.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?

We have modified the RWA I and II programs to give students more opportunities to produce shorter papers. The purposes of this change are threefold. First, more papers give students more opportunities to get paper-related feedback on their individual assignments. Second, students are better able to absorb the key lessons in short assignments. And third, with more assignments, students may be exposed to a greater variety of legal writing assignments. We are also continuing to expand the number of courses in the curriculum that offer substantial writing opportunities.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Supervising and grading writing assignments is very labor intensive, requiring constant meetings with students and evaluations of their written product and the quality of their underlying research. While this is all beneficial for the students, the labor-intensive nature of it means that the College must hire more writing instructors to give the students more supervised writing opportunities and more opportunities for in-depth review of their progress in all areas of writing. We should also increase the number of supervised in-depth research and writing projects students must complete, outside of the examination process, to allow students to demonstrate growth in their writing skills as they progress through law school.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

More professors are considering and/or adopting methods of constant evaluation of students’ learning throughout the semester. This may include short papers, long research papers, midterm exams, or multiple drafts and/or oral presentations of class papers.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

First, they mean we need more writing instructors to work with students in their first year. Second, they likely mean we need to hire more writing instructors to work with upper class students. Finally, they mean we need to fine tune the balance of exam-only courses with those in which students must research, write and more oral presentations to increase our confidence that our graduates are...
proficient in all of the identified areas of focus.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

We continue to rise in the rankings of American law schools. Already the youngest school in the U.S. News and World Report top 100 law schools, we have gone from the 90’s to 60’s in just three years. Our students continue to do very well in both Moot Court and Mock Trial competitions locally, regionally and nationally. This speaks well of our RWA program (as well as our overall program), as these competitions focus on the skills students learn in both RWA I and RWA II. We also continue to get excellent reviews from employers who supervise our students in the Externship programs, as well as those who hire our students upon graduation. Our students are routinely described as hard working, mature, and well prepared for the practice of law. We have continued to increase our students’ opportunities for inter-disciplinary academic work. As we offer more specialized courses in the environmental, developmental, intellectual property, international and health law areas, our students have more opportunities to be joined in their classes by students from Georgia Tech, as well as graduate students in business, biology, chemistry, physics, philosophy, sociology, etc. Post-graduation, our students continue to perform quite well on the Georgia bar examination. Every year, 90-95% of our students pass the bar examination on the first try.

Challenges for Next Year

As always, we seek to improve our delivery of legal education so that our students have an academically rigorous educational experience that prepares them well to enter the work force. Like law schools around the country, we would like to increase our students’ opportunities to get more “hands on” experience through participation in clinics, externships and other live-client experiences, as well as advanced “capstone courses” in which permanent and adjunct faculty work together with small groups of students to help them deal with realistic legal problems.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes

We hope to improve our students’ writing skills even more by giving them more numerous and more diverse opportunities to engage in supervised legal writing.

Modifications in Measurement Methods

We continue to increase the quantity and quality of evaluation of our students’ written work, whether that be through supervised research, midterm essay examinations, students’ reflective grading exercises, or supervised work in legal clinics and externships.

Georgia State University
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2008-2009 Library Media Technology MLM

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organization in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The Library Media Technology Program prepares students to serve as school library media specialists and information technologists in the Pre-K - 12 school environment. The focus is on administering media centers in modern school settings.

Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical experts

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will strive to become experts in their professional responsibilities as school media specialists.

G 2: Critical Reflection Skills

Continue to practice critical reflection skills. The students in the Library Media Technology Program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their media centers. The students will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

G 3: Integrate Library Media Technology content with current technologies

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the subject discipline. The use of technology will be a part of the instruction, curriculum, and reflection practices of the school media specialist. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which school media specialists communicate with their students, other teachers, school personnel, parents and the extended community.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Uses communication skills and technology. (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

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 2: Can motivate and manage students for learning. (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)
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: Can effectively plan for instruction.** (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

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

**O/O 4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.** (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 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.

**O/O 5: Involves school and community in learning.** (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

**O/O 6: Practices professional reflection.** (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)

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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
### Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
**Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and
Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

O5: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O4: Can reflect on the educational learning processes.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

---

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate
demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the
standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 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. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### Target for O1: Uses communication skills and technology.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O3: Can effectively plan for instruction.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

### Target for O4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the
STARS database for Standard 6. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O5: Involves school and community in learning.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**Target for O6: Practices professional reflection.**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

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

**Action Plan**

Maintain and monitor.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Beginning during Professional Advisement Week (PAW) in October, 2009, the Library Media Technology unit will be gathering data on student achievement using a LiveText portfolio.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Faculty in the Library Media Technology unit has designed a LiveText portfolio that will assess a student's progress at specific points throughout the program. This portfolio has been submitted to the LiveText system administrator in MSIT and will be available as a template.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Library Media Technology faculty is moving away from using STARS data to assess student achievement. We will, instead, use data collected from the LMT LiveText portfolio to facilitate programmatic and curriculum decisions and improvements.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The Library Media Technology faculty has designed a new portfolio using LiveText. This portfolio will be assessed at the midpoint of a student's program and again at the final stage of the LMT program. Students will be required to submit the portfolio for assessment
at the beginning of his/her enrollment in the LMT practicum (ELMT 7660 - Internship in Library Media Technology) and again at the beginning of the semester in which they will be graduating. It is anticipated that using this portfolio will allow us to have a more profound knowledge of overall student achievement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Findings for this year’s assessment will have little impact for the MSIT department. However, faculty in the Library Media Technology unit are working closely together to design a more profound data-gathering instrument using LiveText and anticipate having important information that will lead to operational improvements in the coming school year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

It is anticipated that a high degree of improvement will be seen during the coming year as a result of moving from using STARS data as the basis for our student performance assessment to using a LiveText portfolio for Library Media Technology.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

Faculty in the Library Media Technology Unit of MSIT has worked collaboratively to design a LiveText portfolio to be used to assess student achievement.

**Challenges for Next Year**

The Library Media Technology Unit in MSIT will begin gathering data using the LiveText portfolio beginning in October, 2009.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

Intended outcomes in the Library Media Technology Program will be evidenced by data gathered using the LiveText portfolio.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

Modifications in measurement methods in the Library Media Technology Program will be evidenced by data gathered using the LiveText portfolio.

**University-wide Committee Participation**

It is anticipated that information gathered through use of the LiveText portfolio will enrich data-gathering potential for the College of Education and for the University.

**Publications and Presentations**

It is anticipated that use of the LiveText portfolio in the Library Media Technology Program will provide valuable information to aid in research and other scholarly activities.

**Academic Teaching Activities**

Faculty members started using LiveText as the sole course-management software at the beginning of fall semester, 2009. All agree that this program has allowed us the opportunity to focus our teaching activities and begin gathering data reflecting authentic student achievement.

**International Activities**

The use of the LiveText portfolio is allowing our students to design and share course assignments reflecting a commitment to international studies. Such assignments include the following: A study of multicultural and bilingual literature in ELMT 7250 (Survey of Literature for Children) and a budgeting assignment for a Title I school with a majority immigrant population (ELMT 7410 - Administration of Library Media Centers).

**Contributions to Student Retention**

Faculty in the Library Media Technology unit of MSIT believe that the use of the LiveText portfolio will contribute to student retention in the program through encouraging collegiality, professional networking, and a sharing of information resources.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Managerial Science BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Management Department seeks to provide its undergraduate majors with fundamental principles in general management principles, human resource management, operations management, entrepreneurship, and the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations.

This was set as the Department’s Mission in the 2005-2006 cycle. It failed to migrate forward in the WEAVE update for the 2008-2009 cycle.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Student Performance (M: 1, 2)**

Students majoring in Managerial Sciences will master a range of capabilities in human, group, and organizational behavior.
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
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: Performance Relative to Other Schools (O: 1)
As a group students majoring in Managerial Sciences will outperform on an outstanding level compared other student bodies in other business programs on standardized questions relating to management
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Student Performance
Students in Managerial Sciences will perform in high percentiles on the ETS standardized assessment exam that greatly exceed the percentiles of students in other schools taking this exam. Based on the quality of the other schools, and based on the scores other majors in the RCB have against this same pool, RCB Management majors should be scoring in the 85-90 percentile.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
When compared to other participating institutions as a whole, on the Management questions MGS students performed in the 85th percentile in the Fall Semester 2008 administration of the exam, but fell to the 65th percentile with the Spring Semester 2009 administration of the exam. When compared to other participating institutions as a whole on the entire exam, MGS students performed in the 50th percentile in the Fall Semester 2008 administration and in the 45th percentile on the Spring Semester 2009 administration.

M 2: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students (O: 1)
Students will perform in high percentiles on the ETS standardized assessment exam that greatly exceed the percentiles of students in other majors and the RCB student body as a whole.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Student Performance
Managerial Sciences students should significantly exceed the college-wide percentile in answering Management questions on the ETS field exam. MGS students should score in a higher percentile than students in all other majors in the RCB on Management questions on the ETS field exam.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
On the Fall Semester exam managerial sciences students were in the 85th percentile on Management questions. The RCB as a whole was in the 75th percentile. One major in the college, however, scored in the 95th percentile on management questions. All other majors were at least 10 percentiles lower. On the Spring Semester exam managerial sciences students were in the 65th percentile on Management questions. The RCB as a whole was in the 75th percentile. Only one major in the college failed to score at or above the level of MGS students.

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

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
Implementation Description: Oct 15, 2008
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner

Challenging Courses
Evaluate the rigor and challenge of the Department's threshold course for majors, MGS 4000.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
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

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Emphasis on Management Skills

Identify and communicate the value of a Managerial Sciences (MGS) Degree Program, in the context of linking academia to practical application. Gather data for the past 10 years on positions and starting salaries for students graduating with a MGS degree, segmented by career tracks. Track the understanding of the students of the importance of these courses by testing them pre- and post an informational workshop/seminar on MGS career tracks.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- 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
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: The MGS Teaching Innovation Committee
- Budget Amount Requested: $100.00 (recurring)

Improved Instructor Excellence

The MGS Teaching Innovation Committee will conduct future workshops for full-time, part-time faculty, as well as Ph.D. students to facilitate, cultivate, and enable teaching excellence in the classroom. The goal is to engender a rich skill set that fosters a broad stakeholder perspective.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- 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
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: MGS Teaching Innovation Committee
- Budget Amount Requested: $100.00 (recurring)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

In the 2009-2010 Academic Year the department will continue the efforts of the Teaching Innovation Committee to help improve the quality of classroom instruction. On the level of the instructor the Committee will continue to develop and provide training through workshops for all Managerial science instructors on areas where it is determined that teaching methods could be improved. To evaluate the changes in instructor behavior the Committee will develop rubrics that target teaching techniques that can be used for evaluation. Although this is not a direct measure of student learning outcomes, it is strongly believed that by increasing the effectiveness of instruction in the classroom, student learning outcomes will be enhanced across the Department's curriculum. There will be some emphasis shifted to the classroom and to specific course. The Committee believes that high relevance and high rigor inspire students to work harder and to learn more. It is believed that the greatest impact in this regard will be in MGS 4000. This course is the threshold class for Managerial Science majors and all must take it and because the department has four distinctive tracks for majors, this is the only course all students take in common. A complete re-evaluation of the course content will occur in the coming academic year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based in part on a desire to improve the performance of MGS students on comparative standardized tests of management skills, the Department formed a Task Force to look at teaching in the Department, the MGS Teaching Innovation Committee. This committee was charged with improving the quality of teaching in the Department. This is believed to be an effective way of both increasing and assuring a higher level of learning on the part of current Department students, and of attracting other students from the College to the Department’s major. This task force was funded so that it could develop and hold workshops on specific aspects of classroom teaching that would help achieve these goals.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The results of this year’s assessment were consistent with those of the prior years. These were disappointing, however the Department’s view is that changing the quality of instruction throughout the program will be a strategic undertaking. Impacting instructors and classes and doing so over the entire four semesters of upper-division work a full time undergraduate student would be pursuing their major will be reflected after a few years, not right away. It is important that the quality improvement initiatives impact on individual courses and on instructors be included in future assessments so that incremental as well as ultimate performance changes can be monitored.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The Department organized the Teaching Innovation Committee. This became part of the service work load for the Committee members. Funding was allocated for support of workshops the Committee would offer for faculty members.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

This year’s information underscored the need to better train our majors in the field of Management. The students in the major are not working at a level shown by their peers in other majors at Georgia State. These results provide motivation and support for the efforts to increase teaching quality and to review individual course content.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The Teaching Innovation Committee will coordinate the actions within the Department for the MGS major. We anticipate that they will be able to make significant progress in improving both instruction and content of the Department's courses; however we recognize that we are undertaking a multi-year effort to increase learning outcomes across the board and we recognize that our ultimate assessment measures are taken upon graduation and that they, too, will be impacted over a multi-year period.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Marketing BBA**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The overall mission of the Department of Marketing of Georgia State University is to be a pre-eminent thought leader in marketing marketing theory and practice. Our particular mission for our BBA program in Marketing is To deliver high quality instruction in marketing management and strategy and in managerial communication as it specifically pertains to marketing and its role within an organization. To effectively prepare students for entry level positions in marketing, sales and related fields.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Analysis of Marketing Situations/Problems**

Students will be able to accurately describe and analyze marketplace situations, key issues, problems and decisions facing marketing organizations.

**G 2: Applying Quantitative Tools**

Students will be proficient in the use of standard marketing metric tools employed by marketing organizations for situation analyses and development of marketing strategy and tactics.

**G 3: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving**

Students will exhibit critical thinking skills in the process of solving marketing problems and in arriving at logical and feasible solutions/recommendations for marketing organizations.

**G 4: Formulate Marketing Strategy and Tactics**

Students will be able to develop useful and feasible strategies and tactics to address specific marketing situations/problems using the marketing mix.

**G 5: Communication Skills**

Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively in written and oral form.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identify key marketing problems (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to identify key problems facing a marketing organization.

---

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 2: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students will be proficient at the use of standard metrics tools employed in marketing analysis and strategy.

---

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 6 Quantitative Skills
### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions (G: 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Students will be proficient in developing logical and feasible solutions and recommendations to marketing organizations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Critical Thinking

**O/O 4: Clear concise writing (G: 5) (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate proficiency at clear, logical, business-like writing.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

**O/O 5: Oral communication (G: 5) (M: 2)**

Students will be able to engage in clear, meaningful discussion of marketing problems and issues.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2 Oral Communication

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Case Analysis Write Up (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Assessment in the Marketing Department focuses on our capstone course, MK 4900 (Marketing Problems). Our assessments of student performance are based on case analyses, class discussion and group projects. Because group projects are not longer acceptable as measurements of performance, case analysis is used for assessing content-based performance and class discussion grades are used to assess communication skills performance. For this assessment we used scores on students' analysis of a case entitled "Godiva Europe." The case requires students to assess an international marketing/advertising situation, employ marketing metrics (analyze market share across borders, conduct a break-even analysis and produce a pro-forma for an advertising campaign). Students are also required to develop a recommendation regarding the deployment of advertising budgets across several international regions. Cases are graded via a rubric comprised of several items. Student performance on each item is scored on a 100 point scale.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identify key marketing problems**

An average score of 85/100 for relevant scoring items on case analysis rubrics. Clear identification of the decision/problem to be solved. Accurate and insightful overview of (Brand/Marketing Organization) marketplace position Vs competitors. Accurate assessment of (Brand/Marketing Organization) strengths and weaknesses

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met

Average Score = 85.05/100 Average score = 85.05 80 - 84 50% 37.5% 12.5%

**Target for O2: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools**

An average score of 85% or higher/ B or higher on items relevant to marketing metrics on case analysis rubric. Good use of quantitative/qualitative data to support recommendation.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Not Met

Average Score = 67.89/100 85+ 80-84 <80 37.5% 12.5% 50% Obviously, student achievement fell far short of our criterion level. Looking at the breakdown of scores, it appears that there is a sharp dichotomy between those that understand how to use these tools and those that do not. This has been a persistent problem among our majors. Other than their (required) Marketing Research class, they appear to have little or no exposure to marketing metrics prior to enrolling in our capstone class. As noted in our action plan for this item, we believe we have developed a remedy for this issue.

**Target for O3: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions**

An average score of 85% or higher/ B or higher on items relevant to marketing recommendations on case analysis rubric. Recommendation is clear and logical given the marketplace situation.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Partially Met

Average = 83.8/100 85+ 80-84 <80 43.7% 31.3% 25.0% Although the mean score on this item was below criterion level, 75% of students achieved a score (80+) within striking distance of this target. Given the performance on the writing achievement target, we suspect that many of those who fell below the criterion did so because of unclear communication.

**Target for O4: Clear concise writing**

Score of 85% or higher on case analysis rubric. Writing is clear, logical, professional and free of usage and typographical errors.

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Partially Met

82.9/100 85+ 80-84 <80 46.9% 28.1% 25.0% Nearly half of students met or exceeded the criterion for this achievement target, and an additional 28% were within close range. There is obviously room for improvement here.
Students are given a numerical score (e.g. 40 out of 50 total points) for their contribution to case discussions in class over the course of the semester. Typically, there are 7 or more such discussions. The instructor assigns scores to each student after each discussion and posts them within one week on ULearn. In order to account for lapses in memory on the part of the instructor, students may dispute a contribution grade within 24 hours after they are posted. At the end of the semester, the instructor tallies up the total possible points and then develops a percentage score for each student. This percentage is then multiplied by the total possible semester points (in this case 300). This becomes the contribution grade for the student for that semester. Percent of total contribution points is the measure we are using for this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Oral communication**
Average of 85% or higher in class contribution scores. Scores assessed for each student by instructor after formal case discussions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

AVG = 82.5/100  85%  80 - 84 <80  51%  19%  30% Although the average score did not reach our criterion level, over half our students met or exceeded that level. This suggests another dichotomous result. Although we will strive to improve this score, we must also be realistic. By their last semester, students are either willing/able to engage in class discussion, or they are not. Mediocre students, at this point, are more concerned about doing what they have to do to finish, than about improving their communication skills, or their GPA. This is a frustrating area. We will suggest an action plan, but we believe that, even is diligently followed, it may be quite some time before we see substantial improvement in this measure.

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

#### Increase Usage of Written Assignments
We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they develop more assignments that require writing in their classes. This can be as simple as short, one-page reaction papers. We will also encourage them to require students to employ specific writing frameworks (e.g. memorandum) that force them to develop their thoughts logically and clearly. We must also note, here, that we are not writing instructors, and our students are required to take only one business communication course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Increased Class Discussion
We will recommend to undergraduate instructors that they increase their use of class discussion through posing problem solving questions and the use of mini-cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Increased problem solving assignments
The undergraduate curriculum committee will issue a formal recommendation to all undergraduate instructors asking them to include at least 3 problem solving assignments in their syllabus, with provision made for in-class discussion and feedback. We will also recommend that these assignments can be in the form of mini-case analyses. These are often present as end-of-chapter activities in most textbooks and should be fairly easy to implement. These could be either individual or group assignments. They could be take-home or entirely in class. What matters is that they provide students with opportunities to develop their logical and critical thinking abilities. We hope that the cumulative effect will be an improvement in our students’ ability to articulate clear, feasible recommendations on major assignments. We will issue a recommendation along with a copy of this report to all undergraduate instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Fall Semester, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduce Required Course in Marketing Metrics

In the 2008-2009 academic year, we introduced a new course entitled "Marketing Metrics". Our purpose was to better prepare our students for performing the kinds of quantitative analyses employed in marketing management. This is not a marketing research or statistics course but rather it covers such tools as break-even, margin analysis, pro forma development, etc. The course becomes a requirement of all majors in the 2009-2010 academic year. In addition, it will be a pre-requisite for MK 4900, in which these techniques must be applied. Our goal is to improve the ability of our students to perform these types of analyses and to apply the learning from them. We expect that this will be reflected in improved scores on assignments pertinent to this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective): Case Analysis Write Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Fall Semester 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Department Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will issue recommendations, as noted. Issue reminders prior to the beginning of each semester. Request instructors to develop means by which they can track progress of their students with respect to criterion measures of achievement as defined in this report.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have introduced a course in Marketing Metrics. This will become a required course in 2009-2010 Our capstone class (MK 4900) is now part of the CTW initiative. This has led to an increase in the number of written assignments.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

There needs to be renewed emphasis on those areas where our students are not performing as expected. We will issue recommendations (as noted in our action plans). We also have created an Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force, whose job it is to evaluate our curriculum and content and to make recommendations to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Marketing MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students’ previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 1, 2, 3)**
MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing opportunities and problems.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 4, 5)**
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience
### SLO 3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation (M: 6, 7)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate a customer/client orientation.

### SLO 4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information (M: 8, 9)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret appropriate information for solving marketing problems.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Application of Segmentation Analysis (O: 1)
Application of segmentation analysis
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.72, exceeding the target performance level. In addition, the score on each of the 3 criteria exceeded the target performance level.

#### M 2: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)
Development of viable target market(s) and positioning.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.50, exceeding the target performance level. In addition, the score on each of the 3 criteria exceeded the target performance level.

#### M 3: Impact of Competition (O: 1)
Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.17, exceeding the target performance level. In addition, the score on each of the 3 criteria exceeded the target performance level.

#### M 4: Solution Consistent with Analysis (O: 2)
Solution Consistent with analysis.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.55, exceeding the target performance level. Also, both criteria exceeded the performance standard.

#### M 5: Realistic Implementation Plan (O: 2)
Realistic implementation plan.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
The mean score was 1.91, failing to meet the target performance level. Three of the 4 individual criteria fell below the 2.0 standard.

#### M 6: Attention to Customer Satisfaction (O: 3)
Attention to customer satisfaction.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
The mean score was 1.98, barely failing to meet the target performance level. One of the 3 individual criteria fell below the 2.0 standard, while the other 2 just met it.

**M 7: Attention to customer loyalty (O: 3)**
Attention to customer loyalty.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 7 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
The mean score was 2.03, just exceeding the target performance level. One of the 3 individual criteria failed to meet the standard.

**M 8: Student defines the necessary information (O: 4)**
Student defines the information necessary to address question.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.30, exceeding the target performance level. All 3 of the individual criteria also exceeded the standard.

**M 9: Student correctly interprets information collected (O: 4)**
Student correctly interprets information collected.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 9 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The mean score was 2.63, exceeding the target performance level. All of the 3 individual criteria also met the standard.

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

**Communication of Assessment Results**
Provide each faculty member who teaches classes to our MS students with the results of the assessment. These results, including the outcomes/objectives, measures and grading rubrics for each criterion, will communicate to the faculty what the program is striving to achieve. This information in combination with the assessment results will guide faculty in knowing what areas need or would benefit from additional emphasis.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Attention to customer loyalty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Student correctly interprets information collected | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

*Projected Completion Date: 07/2009*
*Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator(Bruce Pilling)*

**Evaluate current assessment case.**
Evaluation of the current case being used to generate the assessment material. Specifically, we need to gauge whether or not this case provides sufficient emphasis on customer loyalty and customer satisfaction.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

*Projected Completion Date: 07/2009*
*Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator(Bruce Pilling)*
ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The following information is provided as background to the interpretation of our assessment results. The MS in Marketing program is a relatively small program with students required to take three marketing courses (buyer behavior, marketing research and strategic market planning) and one MBA course (marketing management). These required courses are taught by a variety of instructors, who will necessarily use a variety of evaluation approaches. Also, students will take 7 additional courses, with up to 3 courses outside of marketing. Given the heterogeneity across courses and instructors, the relatively small number of students coupled with the need to assess individual student work, we have chosen to require our MS students to sit for a common case. The case analysis will then provide the source material to be used in the evaluation of each MS student’s performance on the relevant measures identified in the assessment plan. Given that background, the interpretation of the assessment results is positive in that we met our objective on 6 of the 9 measures and on 22 of the 27 (81%) of the criteria that make up the nine measures. Additionally, the five measures that came up short were “close” to the goal. Given that we are implementing a substantially revised plan for the first time this assessment cycle, the results are encouraging. We were able to assess the work of a greater number of students in a more consistent manner. Also, the grading rubrics are believed to enhance the reliability of the ratings across raters. We fell short of our objective on outcome/objective 3 (demonstrate a customer/client orientation). For this outcome/objective, four of the six criteria that make up the two measures had results that exceeded the standard. There may be a couple of ways to interpret these findings. Of course one interpretation is that our students need additional emphasis on attention to customer satisfaction and to customer loyalty. A second interpretation that will be investigated is whether or not the case selected contained sufficient emphasis on loyalty and satisfaction. Perhaps we need to select a different case that would more prominently raise these issues.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Computation (M: 1, 2)
Students effectively perform arithmetic operations, as well as reason and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Quantitative Skills

SLO 2: Translation (M: 1, 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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: PreQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)
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. Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target for O1: Computation
Targets for the QL quizzes:
• 50% response rate
• 70% success rate

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Quantitative Literacy quizzes were made available to all MATH 1070, 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students this past academic year (both at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester). Completing the quizzes was voluntary with bonus points to tests awarded for each correct response. It was thought that this would encourage students to engage the assessment with an honest effort. Unfortunately, the issue that arose last year (different problem mistakenly got added to the uLearn quiz) was not remedied, so there is incongruent information for the Pre-QL quiz. The marathon question in uLearn was supposed to have been replaced with a pie chart problem, but no such luck. Our goal of response rates of 50% were not met in the fall by any course and only by MATH 1111 and 1113 in the spring. The response rate for MATH 1070 was most discouraging as this was the first year to include these students. The fall semester response was not totally unexpected given the number of graduate teaching assistants or new faculty who did not give the quizzes (some did have access to uLearn for almost a month at the beginning of the semester). However, it was expected that the spring response rate would be better.
One possible cause of the lack of information is uLearn itself. Many MATH 1070 and 1101 instructors reported the inability to access the quiz result report receiving the following error: An unexpected system exception has occurred. A system exception has occurred during the processing of your last request. You may attempt to return to the MyWebCT page. If further problems occur, try logging out of the system, then logging back in. Most (if not all) instructors were unwilling to pull the data by hand as this is an extremely time consuming.

**Target for O2: Translation**

| Targets for the QL quizzes: | 50% response rate | 70% success rate |

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Our goal of response rates of 50% were not met in the fall by any course and only by MATH 1111 and 1113 in the spring. The response rate for MATH 1070 was most discouraging as this was the first year to include these students. The fall semester response was not totally unexpected given the number of graduate teaching assistants or new faculty who did not give the quizzes (some did not have access to uLearn for almost a month at the beginning of the semester). However, it was expected that the spring response rate would be better. One possible cause of the lack of information is uLearn itself. Many MATH 1070 and 1101 instructors reported the inability to access the quiz result report receiving the following error: An unexpected system exception has occurred. A system exception has occurred during the processing of your last request. You may attempt to return to the MyWebCT page. If further problems occur, try logging out of the system, then logging back in. Most (if not all) instructors were unwilling to pull the data by hand as this is an extremely time consuming.

**M 2: PostQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)**

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. Though probability is not a topic covered in four of the five classes, we can see improvement on this question at the end of the semester. Further 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 for Math1070 students. It is interesting to note that the two classes that had formal Problem Solving Activities (Math1111 and Math1113) often outperformed students in Math2211. While in most cases students are not reaching the targeted “success rate” of 70% on these activities, we definitely have seen improvement in performance from the Pre- to the Post QL tests.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Computation**

| Targets for the QL quizzes: | 50% response rate | 70% success rate |

**Target for O2: Translation**

| Targets for the QL quizzes: | 50% response rate | 70% success rate |

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Closer coordination between the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the various course coordinators and the instructors of the individual courses will be put in place to try to find ways to increase the response rates.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In Fall 2008, the department expanded its efforts to include MATH1070. To include MATH 1070 (as we did with MATH 1101 and 2211), the department had to rely on the many different instructors of these classes to upload a uLearn quiz into their respective courses and then export the results and send them to the assessment coordinator. This is often challenging because new instructors often don’t have their uLearn accounts available until after the assessment window in the fall. Also, there are many GTAs who teach MATH 1070 and don’t cooperate with the department’s assessment activities. We continue to be challenged by uLearn itself – there are often problems exporting the data if more students get a problem wrong than right. Also, there were many times that the results for the Pre-QL quiz were exported when the Post-QL data was asked for. In Fall 2008 coordinator level templates are being created in uLearn for MATH 1101, 1070, and 2211. The QL quizzes will be placed in the coordinator course so that when an instructor opens their course for the first time these quizzes will automatically be put in place.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Students are finding it extremely difficult to "blend" different areas of mathematics as is exhibited by the two geometry problems (find the area of an inscribed square or circle). Instructors of these courses will try to incorporate more "blended" types of problems in the coming year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
The use of the Designer Courses for MATH 1070, 1101, and 2211 to distribute the QL quizzes met with mixed success. It is hoped that the new version of WebCT/uLearn will make this facilitation more successful.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Since MATH 1111 and 1113 saw the greatest positive (or least negative) changes in success which of the particular pedagogical elements of those classes is contributing to these changes needs to be identified. The two obvious differences are the overall redesign of the classes and the use of problem solving activities. However, the new course coordinators of MATH 1111 and 1113 wish to remove the problem solving activities from those classes. While this is still be discussed it is hoped that we will be able to determine the effects of the Problem Solving Activities in MATH 1111 and 1113 on the Post-QL quiz.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
We included MATH 1070 for the first time in these assessments.

**Challenges for Next Year**
Increasing instructor participation

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Mathematics BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 non-majors, 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Problem-solving**
Students will become practically oriented problem-solvers

**G 2: Knowledge of the discipline**
Students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline

**G 3: Positions in the discipline**
Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Quantitative skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
This is a general education outcome

- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 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 2: Critical thinking (G: 2) (M: 3)**
This is a general education outcome

- 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 3: Technology (G: 1) (M: 4)**
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 4: Contemporary issues (G: 3) (M: 1)**
This is a general education outcome

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Algorithms for solving applied problems (G: 1) (M: 4)**
The ability to solve applied problems using mathematics tools, 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
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Written communication (G: 3) (M: 2)**
This is a general education outcome

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

**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: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Mathematical proofs are the heart and foundation of mathematics. It is necessary that a successful math major is able to read, analyze and write mathematical proofs.

**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
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: Presentations (O: 1, 4)
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 a computer projector, slides or writing on the whiteboard.

**Source of Evidence:** Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Quantitative skills**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Target for O4: Contemporary issues**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The Department of Mathematics and Statistics continues to use the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) as the primary means to assess the achievements of mathematics majors. In spring 2009, 22 students have taken this course. Each student was required to one 30-minute presentation on a chapter from the textbook “Proofs from the book” and a 15-minute presentation on a published paper written by undergraduate students. The first presentation was given on whiteboard; the second one was presented via a computer projector – students wrote their slides in either PowerPoint or Latex Beamer. All the students did well on these presentations. They read the materials carefully and asked the instructor if they could not justify a step. They learned how to use PowerPoint or Latex Beamer. All the presentations were enthusiastically prepared and well organized.

#### M 2: Homework and Projects (O: 6, 7)
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.

**Source of Evidence:** Project, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Written communication**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
There were three projects on solving applied problems given to students in Math 4991 in spring 2008. The first project asked them to write proofs; most of the 22 students could not write well in the first attempt. With help of the instructor, 19 of the 22 students met the standard in the second attempt. The second project was a programming on Maple; 21 of the 22 students did very well. The last project was writing a research paper of at least 5 pages in LaTeX; all of them did reasonably well. This clearly showed an improvement and a progress during the course.

**Target for O7: Read, analyze, and write mathematical proofs**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Most of the 22 students had trouble writing mathematical proofs. After detailed comments were given on their first version of a project, they showed a great deal of improvement on their second try.

#### M 3: Class participation and individual contact (O: 1, 2)
Students take advantage of all class activities and work in study groups

**Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Quantitative skills**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All but one student actively, enthusiastically, and creatively participated in the classes. They frequently came to the instructor’s office hours. Only two students were absent more than twice. Majority of the students showed good mathematical quantitative skills.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking**
80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students of the Senior Seminar class showed the ability of critical thinking by being able to formulate questions and comments clearly.

#### M 4: Technology Projects (O: 3, 5)
All students should be able to use Maple, Matlab and LATEX while working on various problems.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O3: Technology

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Math 4991 course was taught in a classroom with computers and computer projectors. Students used technology Maple to solve a mathematical problem, and used LaTeX to present two projects. They used PowerPoint or LaTeX Beamer to give presentations. All but one student could use Maple well. All students could write in LaTeX.

### Target for O5: Algorithms for solving applied problems

80% of the students should master at least 80% of the skills related to this learning outcome

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

While working on the technology projects, most students in the Senior Seminar class were able to implement analytical and numerical algorithms (and combine them when necessary) for solving applied problems. Students learned to analyze their algorithms for accuracy and efficiency.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The assessment coordinator for Mathematics BS will work in a close contact with the departmental undergraduate mathematics committee. Special emphasis will be made on the improvement of student proof writing skills and introduction to various types of mathematics software.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department has discontinued the use of Quantitative Literacy Quizzes (QLQ) to get the assessment information for Mathematics BS, because it overlaps with the assessment of mathematics contribution to the core. The QLQ are conducted in three 1000 and one 2000 level courses, while the purpose of Mathematics BS assessment is to see the progress of math majors towards the end of the program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The use of a capstone course Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) in assessing student learning outcomes for Mathematics BS proved to be effective. At the present time, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) is required of all Mathematics majors who are under catalog 2005-2006 or later. Although there are few “non-traditional” math majors under earlier catalogs, the vast majority of our current majors are required to take Math 4991 before they can graduate. As the result, the department is able to collect an accurate assessment data on our student performance. Based on the findings of this year’s assessment, the prerequisite change proposal has been prepared for Math 4991. The proposal is under consideration by the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee and will be submitted to the college in January.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Our goal here is to use the existing operational structure more effectively. In particular, to get the departmental undergraduate mathematics committee actively engaged in the assessment work.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The department is trying to get more faculty members involved in teaching the capstone course Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), and to further develop the related undergraduate research program for our majors.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The undergraduate mathematics committee will work closely with the improvement of instruction committee to make sure that the assessment data is used effectively for our course redesign projects.

---

**Georgia State University**
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Unknown (M: 8, 10)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Unknown (M: 2, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Unknown (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 11)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Unknown (M: 1, 3, 4, 9, 13)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Unknown (M: 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Unknown (M: 2, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Unknown (O: 3, 4)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Unknown (O: 2, 3, 5, 6)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O5: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### Target for O6: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 3: Unknown (O: 4)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O4: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 4: Unknown (O: 4)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O4: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 5: Unknown (O: 3, 5)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O5: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 6: Unknown (O: 3)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O3: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 7: Unknown (O: 2, 5, 6)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Unknown
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

Target for O5: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

Target for O6: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 8: Unknown (O: 1)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 9: Unknown (O: 2, 4, 5, 6)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

Target for O4: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

Target for O5: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

Target for O6: Unknown
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Unknown (O: 1)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Unknown</strong></td>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Unknown (O: 3, 5)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Unknown</strong></td>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Unknown (O: 2, 6)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Unknown</strong></td>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Unknown (O: 4)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Unknown</strong></td>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Unknown (O: 2)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Unknown</strong></td>
<td>90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 15: Unknown (O: 2, 5, 6) | Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work |
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Target for O5: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Target for O6: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 16: Unknown (O: 6)**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 17: Unknown (O: 2, 5, 6)**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Target for O5: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Target for O6: Unknown**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 18: Unknown (O: 2, 5, 6)**

Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Unknown

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### Target for O5: Unknown

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### Target for O6: Unknown

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

### M 19: Unknown (O: 2)

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Unknown

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

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

#### To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either
met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
 Priority: High
 Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
 Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
 Additional Resources: None
 Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
 Priority: High
 Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
 Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
 Additional Resources: None
 Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
 Priority: High
 Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
 Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
 Additional Resources: None
 Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
 Priority: High
 Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
 Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
 Additional Resources: None
 Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
 Priority: High
 Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
 Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
 Additional Resources: None
 Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels. The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

None

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
## Mission / Purpose
This program should be listed as Mathematics Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University Online M.Ed. Program in Mathematics Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

## Goals
**G 1: Goal Statement**
The goal of the MEd Online Mathematics Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in mathematics and pedagogical practices which includes working with diverse student populations, problem solving, and literacy.

## Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Expected Outcome 1 (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will investigate issues of equity in the mathematics classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Expected Outcome 2 (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will engage in pedagogical practices that promote problem solving and inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Expected Outcome 3 (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that promotes literacy and is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Unknown (O: 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target for O1: Expected Outcome 1**

80% of the students will score 20 out of 25 points in order to achieve this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students (100%) met the standard.

### M 2: Measure for Learning Outcome 2 (O: 2)

| Students are to develop a unit plan designed to teach a mathematical concept using the Georgia Performance Standards and the National Council of Teacher of Mathematics Standards as references. The unit plan should contain no less than five complete lesson plans, and should include an introduction (title, duration of class, grade level, and rationale), goals, behavioral objectives using Bloom's Taxonomy, linkage to national and state performance standards, background information about target audience, instructional processes, concept map, alignment with concept map, objectives, and instructional processes, closure, reflections, references, and resources. |

| Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |

**Target for O2: Expected Outcome 2**

80% of students will score a minimum of 24/30 in order to achieve this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students met or exceeded the target.

### M 3: Measure for Learning Outcome 3 (O: 3)

| The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teachers to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the students will examine two mathematics curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one National Council of Teacher Mathematics Standards reform. The students will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum. |

| Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |

**Target for O3: Expected Outcome 3**

80% of students will score 12/15 in order to meet this target.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students met or exceeded the target.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to achieve the goals of the action plan faculty will: 1. Align syllabi with National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards for all pedagogical courses. 2. Develop a common approach to improving students’ understanding of planning inquiry lessons. 3. Embed in their courses content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is a new degree report and there was no report for last year.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In order to achieve the expected targets, a good percentage of the students had to resubmit the required documents. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, strategies for planning inquiry lessons, and content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses that are offered in the program. Faculty will develop a common approach to improving students' understanding of planning inquiry lessons, and this type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Education.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Mathematics Education--TEEMS MAT**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (M: 1)**

The teacher candidate demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs (M: 2)**

The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience
**O/O 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners (M: 3)**
The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn (M: 4)**
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator (M: 5)**
The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1)**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 1.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content 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 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
85% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**M 2: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2)**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 2.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs**
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 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
85% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**M 3: INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio (O: 3)**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 3.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse 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 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
95% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**M 4: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio (O: 4)**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 4.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
92% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**M 5: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio (O: 5)**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livestext for Standard 5.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
90% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Our department will be supportive to faculty in their pursuit for improving the program, curriculum, and most importantly the development of effective mathematics teachers for urban and suburban school environments.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Based on courses, e-portfolio assessments, and streamlining the field placements, 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 and such placements have become our department-wide initiative. However, we will continue to monitor this effort. Relationships across the school and university communities have become stronger. Our department is utilizing the PDS sites advantageously.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
This year's assessment based on the standards are good and improving. Our department chair encourages and supports faculty in these continued efforts. The standards that are borderline to our target will be modified for further improvement. An interdisciplinary action plan within the program was initiated and we will continue to maintain and monitor such initiatives to develop effective mathematics teachers.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Mathematics MS
### Goals

**G 1: Assess graduate curriculum and learning outcomes**  
Develop and assess learning outcomes for the program using specific outcomes for courses and thesis work.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills. (M: 5, 8, 11, 14)**  
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 2: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written (M: 6, 15)**  
Graduates should demonstrate communication skills, both oral and written. This includes the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate Analytical Skills (M: 1, 5, 8, 14)**  
The analytical skills in Statistics include skills to collect data, computer skills, and understanding research reports/articles.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate knowledge of the discipline. (M: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13)**  
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.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving. (M: 1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14)**  
Graduates should demonstrate advanced quantitative reasoning and problem solving ability. This includes numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Demonstrate numerical competency. (O: 3, 4)**  
Students demonstrate numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 2: See connections across fields. (O: 5)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 3: Understand research problems. (O: 5)**  
Students show the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.  
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 4: Show an appreciation for history of mathematics. (O: 5)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 5: Extend solution methods. (O: 1, 3, 4)**  
Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 6: Expain ideas to nonspecialists. (O: 2, 5)**  
Students show the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.  
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 7: Develop a mathematical intuition. (O: 5)**  
Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 8:</td>
<td>Draw conclusions from data. (O: 1, 3, 4) Students show the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9:</td>
<td>Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3) Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10:</td>
<td>To read and understand the research articles. (O: 5) Students should be able to read and understand the research reports/articles in statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11:</td>
<td>To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 1, 3) Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12:</td>
<td>Show key knowledges in statistical theories. (O: 5) Students should articulate key mathematical/statistical concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13:</td>
<td>Know the update knowledges in statistics. (O: 5) Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14:</td>
<td>Analyze and interpret data through proofs. (O: 1, 3, 4) Students should be able to analyze and interpret data through either proofs or algorithms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15:</td>
<td>Show effective written communication. (O: 2) Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Evaluate learning Outcomes Math 8110**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8110 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8110

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8120**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8120 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 812-

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8200**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8200 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Instructor of Math 8200
Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8220  
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8220 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8220

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8610  
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8610 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8620  
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8620 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8620

Evaluation at thesis defense.  
An evaluation form should be used to evaluate each student’s thesis.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:  
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?  
We will select another set of graduate level courses for which to specifically evaluate the learning outcomes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?  
Why were these changes made?  What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
We have generally been attempting to ensure that our courses achieve outcomes that give the students knowledge and skills needed to continue successfully in later courses. Tracking learning outcomes of paired sequences of courses (e.g. Math 8110 and 8120) is directly useful for this goal.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:  
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data?  (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?)  If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  

Over the past year we evaluated the extent to which students met specific course learning outcomes in 5 courses: Math 8110, Math 8120, Math 8220, Math 8610, and Math 8620. All scores were based on a four point scale. In Math 8110, the average of the students on each of the outcomes varied from 3.0 to 3.1. In Math 8120, the students had outcomes varying from 2.5 to 2.8. In Math 8220, the outcomes varied from 3.0 to 3.5. In Math 8610 the outcomes varied from 2.8 to 3.2. And in Math 8620 the outcomes varied from 2.2 to 3.0. (The 2.2 was something of a special case. All other outcomes were between 2.5 and 3.0.) While the results in some courses are clustered, in some cases the results suggest outcomes that could benefit from specific attention. Notably In Math 8620 the learning outcome with the lowest score was associated with assessing accuracy of numerical computations.

Goals

G 1: Is committed to student learning and development  
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

G 2: Can apply knowledge of learning and development
Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will draw upon their knowledge of learning theories and apply their knowledge in practical classroom contexts.

G 3: Knows how to manage & monitor learning/development
Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will be able to monitor and manage students' learning and development effectively.

G 4: The student is a reflective practitioner.
Students will think systematically about their practice and will draw upon professional and practical experience to inform their teaching.

G 5: Participate in professional learning communities

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 3)**
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning and development.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Demonstrates commitment to learning/development (M: 1)**
Educators are committed to the learning and development of students in urban contexts.

**O/O 2: Applies knowledge of learning and development (M: 2)**
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning and 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 an active 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, comp's, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Demonstrates commitment to learning/development**
Ninety percent (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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**M 2: Faculty STARS standard 2 rating (O: 2)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O2: Applies knowledge of learning and development**
Ninety percent (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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**M 3: Faculty STARS standard 3 rating (O: 3)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this...
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

M 4: Faculty STARS standard 4 rating (O: 4)

A summary derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Ninety percent (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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

M 5: Faculty STARS standard 5 rating (O: 5)

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O5: Participates in profession's learning communities

Ninety percent (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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

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

Recommend Deactivation of Program

The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty STARS standard 1 rating | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates commitment to learning/development

Implementation Description: The faculty will recommend that the program be deactivated by December 2011. This should give current students ample time to complete their degree requirements.

Projected Completion Date: 11/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator: Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross Department Associate Chair: Dr. Mary Ariail
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?  
Program faculty will file necessary paperwork to deactivate the program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
Last year’s Action Plan included the following: “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.” The program experienced a loss of the program coordinator (Dr. Kezia McNeal), and enrollments for the program dropped rather than increased.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment
The current faculty made the decision to deactivate the program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

None

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The decision to drop the program will mean that faculty will be able to concentrate their time and resources toward other Middle Level programs (i.e., the two MAT programs in Middle Level Education and the new BSE in Middle Level Education).

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Program faculty will work closely with the remaining students to ensure high quality learning experiences for them.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Most Important Accomplishments for Year
The department hired a new clinical faculty, Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross, to coordinate all program, including the MED in Middle Childhood Education. Dr. Behm Cross examined current records and created a complete list of current students in the program.

#### Challenges for Next Year
During the coming year, plans for deactivating the program will be started. All necessary paperwork will be submitted to the department, the college, and the university.

#### Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None

#### Modifications in Measurement Methods
The new program faculty will use the existing portfolio and assessment rubric to evaluate current students.

#### University-wide Committee Participation
N/A

#### Publications and Presentations
N/A

#### Academic Teaching Activities
N/A

#### International Activities
N/A

#### Contributions to Student Retention
N/A

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Unknown (M: 1)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Unknown (M: 1)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Unknown (M: 1)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: Unknown (M: 1)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 3: Unknown (M: 1)

O/O 4: Unknown (M: 1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

Target for O1: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target MET - 100% (8 of 8 teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Language Arts/Social Studies content and curriculum.

Target for O2: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target MET - 100% (8 of 8 teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain.

Target for O3: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 82% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Learning Environments domain.

Target for O4: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 87.5% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Assessment domain.

Target for O5: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 91.67% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Planning and Instruction domain.

Target for O6: Unknown

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of
the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 84% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Professionalism domain.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Program faculty have already identified courses and assignments within the curriculum to provide additional and/or more rigorous experiences for MCE TEEM LA/SS teacher candidates.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have updated our LiveText portfolio system to use the Georgia Framework for Teaching to use in addition to the STARS system in order to ensure we obtain a comprehensive view of the status of MCE TEEMS LA/SS.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have identified four areas which require some strengthening in both curricular and teacher practice. This report verifies anecdotal evidence of the need to improve our work with Learning Environments, Assessment, Planning and Instruction, and Professionalism. We have already begun improvements in our curriculum and teaching approaches which will address these issues and provide for higher success rates next year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Middle Grades Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content and Curriculum (M: 1, 2)**

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.

**SLO 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student data; identifies students' stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develops and uses a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicates with student families/guardians; understands the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understands the range of individual differences of all young adolescents and the implications of these differences for teaching and learning; and, understand issues of young adolescent health and sexuality.
SLO 3: Planning and Instruction (M: 1, 2, 4)

The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

SLO 4: Professionalism (M: 1, 2)

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locate resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

SLO 5: Learning Environments (M: 1, 2)

The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Assessment (M: 1, 2)

The teacher candidate will have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory; collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals; use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process; identify students’ learning needs and provide students with goals for learning; develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures; report student progress to students, families, and administrators; use required resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Faculty Ratings (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O1: Content and Curriculum

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Content and Curriculum domain.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Students and Learning

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Target for O3: Planning and Instruction

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Planning domain.
Target for **O4: Professionalism**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 88.9% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Reflective Practice: Professional Development domain.

Target for **O5: Learning Environments**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Motivation and Management standard. Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Communication and Technology standard.

Target for **O6: Assessment**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Assessment standard.

M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for **O1: Content and Curriculum**

90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Content and Curriculum Standard.

Target for **O2: Knowledge of Students and Learning**

90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP PRINCIPLE II. KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS AND THEIR LEARNING Standard.

Target for **O3: Planning and Instruction**

90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Planning and Instruction Standard.

Target for **O4: Professionalism**

90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Met 77% (14 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Professionalism Standard.

Target for **O5: Learning Environments**

90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Learning Environments Standard.

### Target for O6: Assessment
90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Assessment Standard.

### M 3: Faculty Ratings (O: 2)
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

### Target for O2: Knowledge of Students and Learning
90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText received a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

### M 4: Planning and Instruction (O: 3)
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

### Target for O3: Planning and Instruction
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
90% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain.

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

#### Additional support in professionalism
Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty; field experiences director
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Strengthening knowledge of professionalism
While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
We have identified and developed course assignments within the program to provide additional learning opportunities for our teacher candidates.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have identified and developed changes in course assignments to respond to last year's assessment report.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We have identified one area (professionalism) that requires some strengthening. Based on this information, we have already made changes in the coursework to address this issue thus to be able to meet our achievement target better next year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Modern & Classical Languages Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Modern and Classical Languages is committed to the advancement of knowledge about contemporary and ancient languages and, in particular, about the ways in which they impact civilization by molding numerous cultures and shaping their literatures. The Department’s excellence in research, teaching and service benefits students and colleagues by broadening their understanding of the world community and strengthening their ability to function in a cross-cultural and multicultural environment, and as a result, contributes to the general betterment of society.

Goals
G 1: Oral communication
The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical accuracy.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: ORAL COMMUNICATION (G: 1)
Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and comprehensibility.

Presentational communication: tasks in which students create spoken language. This mode will be used to assess vocabulary use and fluency.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
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

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lower Division Spanish instructors

Oral Communication
The Department of Modern and Classical Languages (MCL henceforth) has been implementing some sort of oral communication assessment among students taking first-year Spanish. The assessment requires special considerations since the enrollment limits for elementary Spanish classes is 30-32 students. In a regular fall or spring semester there are 35 sections of first-year Spanish.

An informal survey of oral assessment conducted among colleagues, shows that the most common form used is face-to-face interviews during office hours. Given the special make up of Georgia State students, there are many students who could not meet office hours because they have previous engagements (academic and otherwise) at those times. The second form is to take the last week of classes and conduct interviews during that time. Experience shows that the second modality always presents circumstances that throw off the schedule, aside from the fact that one has to sacrifice class time. Also, the assessment needs to be recorded in order to verify scores, and as evidence in case of grade disputes.

The MCL faculty has agreed to meet during FA09 to discuss possible venues of assessing oral communication on the core. The French and German sections are going to conduct face-to-face interviews, while the Spanish section has yet to determine how oral communication will be assessed. The three sections have decided to use the same type of assessment but due to the number of students (and sections) in Spanish there will be different instruments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Meetings will start promptly during the fall 2009.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Learning Outcomes Committee
Additional Resources: Language Lab facilities

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Multiple and Severe Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the five concentrations in Multiple and Severe Disabilities (Autism, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Moderate, Severe, and Profound Mental Retardation, and Physical and Health Disabilities), is to prepare graduate level teachers who are grounded in research-based curriculum development, instructional technology, data collection and interpretation, and the ethical foundations of the profession. The program prepares teachers to be responsive to the learning needs of students, the concerns and questions of parents, and the collaborative needs of related professionals. The program provides students with recommendations for certification in Special Education: General Curriculum or Special Education: Adapted Curriculum. New program plans were developed and approved during 05-06 for this program. During 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. During the current 08-09 year, the program had approximately 92 students; 24 completed the master’s program in Summer 08 through Spring 09.

Goals
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy. (G: 1) (M: 1)

The teacher demonstrates understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches by creating learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn (G: 2) (M: 2)

The student demonstrates understanding of how children learn and develop over a period of time, by providing learning opportunities that demonstrate a child's intellectual, social, and/ or behavioral development/ growth.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 3: Effectively teaches diverse learners. (G: 3) (M: 3)

The teacher demonstrates understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and uses effective communication and professional behavior while differentiating instruction based on student need.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</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>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43 Effective utilization of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 4: Effectively plans for instruction. (G: 4) (M: 4)

The teacher plans for and uses assessment in instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student needs, the community and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience
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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Teaching Sequence (O: 1)
EXC 7190 Teaching Sequence using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include: Rationale and design, lesson plans and continuous assessments and post-assessments and discussion of findings.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.
90% of more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
With an N of 24 students, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The mean score was a 3.5.

M 2: Pupil Change Project (O: 2)
P-12 change project using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include a description of the behavior to be changed, a treatment for change, baseline and treatment data or pre and post instructional data, and analysis and discussion of the results.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
With an N of 24, 84% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The mean score was 3.4.

M 3: Performance Evaluation (O: 3)
Performance Evaluation Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include indicators based on the Georgia Framework.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O3: Effectively teaches diverse learners.
90% of students will score at our above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
With an N of 24 100% of students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric. The mean score was 3.6.

M 4: Lesson Plan (O: 4)
Lesson Plan Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest to include lesson title and description, primary learning outcomes, procedures, technology, assessment, modifications, extension, and reflection.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O4: Effectively plans for instruction.
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the Lesson Plan rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
With an N of 24, 100% of students scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The mean score was 3.5.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
The faculty will review the rubric for measure 2 (pupil change project) to make sure that whoever applies it can do so reliably. The faculty will continue to use the new indicators and the target rate of 50% for the upcoming year. Also, the faculty have designed a new rubric for performance that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Data for the MSD program were collected on new indicators this year as recommended in our APR plan. Also, the faculty have
designed a new rubric for performance that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data indicate that student performance remains above the 90% target mark for 3 of the 4 measures and at 84% for one measure (pupil change project). The faculty have indicated that student performance on these measures is adequate and a representative reflection of student abilities and skills. We will review the rubric for measure 2 (pupil change project) to make sure that whoever applies it can do so reliably. The faculty will continue to use the new indicators and the target rate of 90% for the upcoming year. Also, the faculty have designed a new rubric for performance that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.
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.

Goals
G 4: Marketability for jobs
Students will graduate from our undergraduate programs with the ability to be highly marketable in their chosen concentration (performance, music education, composition, jazz studies, music technology, music management).

G 1: Broad Knowledge
Students will graduate with a broad knowledge of music including traditional western music theory and history, the ability to improvise and compose, the ability to use computer applications in music, and the ability to teach in a specific concentration area.

G 2: Outstanding Performers
Students will graduate as outstanding performers on their major instrument or voice type.

G 3: Music of Diverse Culture
Students will graduate with an understanding of music of diverse cultures including non-Western disciplines. This does NOT include popular music.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Theoretical Understanding (G: 1, 4) (M: 2)
Perceives, analyzes, and explains the theoretical structure of music in styles and genres from pre-Renaissance through contemporary eras, and demonstrates independent synthesis of this knowledge when listening, creating, and performing

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context (G: 1, 4) (M: 1, 5)
Places Western and non-Western music in historical and cultural context

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Use of Technology (G: 1, 4) (M: 3, 8)
Uses appropriate applications of technology in listening, creating, and performing music

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### SLO 4: Performs at Advanced Level (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 7)
Performs diverse repertoire with advanced levels of musicianship in large ensembles, small ensembles, and as a soloist.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 5: Conducting Skills (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 4)
The student will demonstrate functional conducting skills so that he/she is able to do so when called upon in the profession. This outcome applies to all music concentrations, not just those in the education concentration.

**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**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 6: Keyboard Skills (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 6)
The student will possess functional keyboard skills.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### SLO 7: Improvising Skills (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will be able to improvise at a basic level and have the ability to teach basic improvisation if called upon to do so.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Music History II (O: 2)
Student completes Music History II with satisfactory or better achievement as stipulated by rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context**
- At least 80% of students enrolled in History II in the Spring semester. The grading breakdown was as follows: A - 12 B - 12 C - 4 D - 3 F - 5 This yielded a result of 75% of students scoring a C or better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

#### M 2: Theory IV (O: 1)
Student will demonstrate prescribed knowledge and proficiency as indicated by grade of C or better in Theory IV.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Theoretical Understanding**
- At least 80% of students enrolled in Theory IV will receive a grade of C or better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Of the 65 students enrolled in MUS 2450 Theory IV in Spring semester 18 received a grade of A, 21 a B, 24 a C, and 2 an F. This resulted in 96.9% of students receiving a grade of C or better.

**M 3: Computer Applications (O: 3)**

Music technology students demonstrate satisfactory or better progress in MUS 4981 (Advanced Topics in Computer Music), as indicated by grading rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Use of Technology**

At least 80% of students enrolled in Computer Applications in Music will receive a grade of C or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the 13 students enrolled, 11 received an A, 1 a B and 1 a WF resulting in 92% receiving a grade of C or higher.

**M 4: Advanced Conducting (O: 5)**

Student evidences advanced conducting knowledge and proficiency as evidenced by satisfactory or better performance on rubric-based grading system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Conducting Skills**

At least 80% of students enrolled in Advanced Instrumental and Advanced Choral Conducting will receive a grade of C or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the given classes received an A or a B with 24 receiving an A and 6 a B.

**M 5: Repertoire Analysis (O: 2)**

Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O2: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context**

Through large ensemble, small ensemble, and solo performance, students perform music representing at least 7 or more composers, genres, styles, and eras.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

A thorough examination of large ensemble, small ensemble, recital, lab and jury programs showed that students overwhelmingly exceeded this Achievement Target with the majority of students performing music representing over a dozen composers, genres, styles, and eras. It might be possible that this Achievement Target is set too low, or is no longer relevant or needed.

**M 6: Piano Proficiency (O: 6)**

Students demonstrate satisfactory or better proficiency in Piano IV (MUS 2720)

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O6: Keyboard Skills**

80% of students will receive a grade of C or better in Piano IV class which is the capstone class for the piano cycle.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The 37 students received grades as follows: A - 10 B - 13 C - 11 F - 2 WF - 1 91% received a grade of C or better in the capstone piano class.

**M 7: Music Juries (O: 4)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O4: Performs at Advanced Level**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Of the 245 students who gave juries, 238 were passed to the next level, 7 were retained. This is an exceptionally high number indicating either (1) musical excellence, (2) too easy of a barrier to pass, or (3) some combination of these factors.

**M 8: 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Use of Technology**
80% of students enrolled in MUS 4730 will receive a grade of C or better

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students received a grade of C or higher (12 A's, 14 B's, 2 C's)

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

**Action Plan for History II**
The following action plan will be implemented: 1. Give students more frequent feedback throughout the semester about grades 2. Attempt to have more cohesion between History I and II courses

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Music History II
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Lee Orr, Division Head, Foundation Studies

**Critical Thinking Assessment**
Periodic meetings will be held of the humanities (core) music faculty during the fall semester of 2010 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 2011.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Music History II
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context

- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **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. An excellent rubric has already been developed by the Voice Area. It is our hope that this will serve as the jumping off point for other areas as well.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Advanced Conducting
  - Outcome/Objective: Conducting Skills
  - Measure: Computer Applications
  - Outcome/Objective: Use of Technology
  - Measure: Music History II
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context
  - Measure: Music Juries
  - Outcome/Objective: Performs at Advanced Level
  - Measure: Piano Proficiency
  - Outcome/Objective: Keyboard Skills
  - Measure: Repertoire Analysis
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context
  - Measure: Technology Proficiency
  - Outcome/Objective: Use of Technology
  - Measure: Theory IV
  - Outcome/Objective: Theoretical Understanding

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty, Ad Hoc Assessment committee

**Learning Outcomes and Rubrics**
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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Advanced Conducting
  - Outcome/Objective: Conducting Skills
  - Measure: Computer Applications
  - Outcome/Objective: Use of Technology
  - Measure: Music History II
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context
  - Measure: Music Juries
  - Outcome/Objective: Performs at Advanced Level
  - Measure: Piano Proficiency
  - Outcome/Objective: Keyboard Skills
  - Measure: Repertoire Analysis
  - Outcome/Objective: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context
  - Measure: Technology Proficiency
  - Outcome/Objective: Use of Technology
  - Measure: Theory IV
  - Outcome/Objective: Theoretical Understanding

- **Implementation Description:** This would set the target date after our NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) Accreditation Review and campus visit

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Entire Faculty

*Georgia State University*
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Music Masters
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 2: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style
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

SLO 4: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge
Demonstrates research skills in music and advanced understanding of the literature and repertoire appropriate for his or her concentration
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Nursing BS
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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 is to create a premier multicultural learning environment that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery to Georgia and beyond.

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking
Apply concepts and theories as a basis for problem solving, decision-making, and critical thinking in nursing.

G 2: Research
Integrate knowledge from nursing research in caring for individuals, families, groups, and the community.

G 3: Generalist Nursing Knowledge
Integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups or the community.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: Evidence Based Practice (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students will complete an evidence based practice paper in either NURS 3610 or NURS 3710 and will obtain at least 74 % on the grading rubric.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
6 Quantitative 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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
Alumni completing the alumni survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).


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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: CTW (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Graduates who enter the program in Fall 2009 or thereafter will take two critical thinking through writing courses.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 2: Critical Thinking Exam (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students in the nursing program will complete a standardized critical thinking exam in their first semester and the last semester of the nursing program.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 4: Research Article Critique (G: 2) (M: 5)
All students will complete a research article critique as part of the course work in NURS 3500 and will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
O/O 5: Literature Search Activity (G: 2) (M: 6)
All students enrolled in NURS 3500 Nursing Research will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. Students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points on the rubric.


General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (G: 3) (M: 7)
Graduates of the pre-licensure program will successfully complete the NCLEX with a first time pass rate of 85% or better.


General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 7: Exit Survey (G: 3) (M: 8)
Graduating seniors completing the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).


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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: CTW NURS 2080 (O: 1)
Students enrolled in NURS 2080 will complete four clinical narratives and by the fourth clinical narrative will be demonstrating an increased performance in their critical thinking as evidenced by an increased score in item six (Critical thinking is evident in the clinical narrative and during the decision making process.) of the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: CTW
100% of the students in NURS 2080 will complete four clinical narratives and by the fourth clinical narrative 85% of the students will demonstrate an increased performance in their critical thinking as evidence by an increased score in item six (Critical thinking is evident in the clinical narrative and during the decision making process.) of the rubric

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
For F 2008 and SP 2009: 100% of the students enrolled in NURS 2080 completed four clinical narratives. For F2008 72.3% of the students enrolled in NURS 2080 showed an increase in the score in item six on the rubric from the first to the last clinical narrative; 10.7% remained the same; and 16.9% decreased. For SP 2009 87.1% of the students enrolled in NURS 2080 showed an increase in the score in item six on the rubric from the first to the last clinical narrative; 8.5% remained the same; and 4.2% decreased.

**M 2: CTW NURS 4600 (O: 1)**

All students enrolled in NURS 4600 will complete the CTW assignment and obtain a minimum of 74% on the evaluation rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: CTW**

100% of the students in NURS 4600 will complete the CTW assignments and obtain a minimum of 74% on the evaluation rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students in NURS 4600 completed the CTW assignment in both F 2008 and SP 2009. For F 2008 there were a total of four CTW written assignments. By the fourth CTW written assignment 100% of the students had a 74% or better on the evaluation rubric. For SP 2009 there were three CTW written assignments. By the third CTW written assignment 100% of the students had a 74% or better on the evaluation rubric.

**M 3: Standardized critical thinking exam (O: 2)**

85% of the graduating seniors taking a standardized critical thinking test will receive a score at or above the national average on their first attempt.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Exam**

85% of the graduating seniors taking a standardized critical thinking test will receive a score at or above the national average on their first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

The current standardized critical thinking exam that is used is one provided by ERI. For SU 2008 there were 11 graduating seniors who took the exam of these 90% obtained a score at or above the national average. For F 2008 there were 41 graduating seniors who took the exam and 70.73% obtained a score at or above the national average. For SP 2009 there were 57 graduating seniors who took the exam and 87.7% obtained a score at or above the national average.

**M 4: Evidence based practice project (O: 3)**

Students will complete an evidence based practice paper in either NURS 3610 or NURS 3710 and will obtain at least 74 % on the grading rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Evidence Based Practice**

100% of the students will complete an evidence based practice project in either NURS 3610 or 3710 and 85% of the students will obtain a 74% or greater on the grading rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

For NURS 3610 and NURS 3710 the following data applies: For SU 2008 96.7% of the students completed the evidence based practice project and obtained a 74% or greater on the grading rubric. For F2008 100% of the students completed the evidence based practice project and 96.2% of the students obtained a 74% or greater on the grading rubric. For SP 2009 100% of the students completed the evidence based practice project and 97.1% of the students obtained a 74% or better on the grading rubric.

**M 5: Research Article Critique (O: 4)**

All students will complete a research article critique as part of the course work in NURS 3500 and at least 90% will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Research Article Critique**

100% of students will complete the research article critique and at least 90% will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The associated course, NURS 3500, is offered three times a year so results are listed for each semester and then cumulatively. SU 08 - 10 Students: 100% completed the critique and 100% obtained a minimum of 74% F 08 - 52 Students: 100% completed the critique and 100% obtained a minimum of 74% SP 09 - 72 Students: 100% completed the critique and 83% obtained a minimum of 74% Cumulative: 134 Students: 100% completed the critique and 91% obtained a minimum of 74%

**M 6: Literature Search Activity Paper (O: 5)**

All students enrolled in NURS 3500 will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. Students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O5: Literature Search Activity**

100% of students will complete the literature search activity paper and at least 90% will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

The associated course, NURS 3500, is offered all three semesters and results are listed for each semester and then cumulatively. For SU 2008 - 10 Students: 100% of students completed literature search activity and 100% of students obtained at least 74%. For F 2008 - 52 Students: 100% of students completed literature search activity and 94% of the students obtained at least 74%. Cumulative - 134 Students: 100% of students completed literature search activity and 97% of students obtained at least 74%.

M 7: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (O: 6)

85% of the graduates of the undergraduate nursing program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.

Target for O6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

85% of the graduates of the undergraduate nursing program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

For the 2008 calendar year we had 124 students take the NCLEX with a first time pass rate of 96.77%. Rates for the 2009 calendar year are not yet available.

M 8: Exit Survey (O: 7)

85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

Target for O7: Exit Survey

85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will select Good or Excellent on a five item scale of Poor to Excellent with Excellent indicating the most prepared in the program outcome: "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community".

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

For December 2008 graduates who completed the survey (N=24) 87.5% indicated Good or Excellent on the identified item. For May 2009 graduates who completed the survey (N=41) 80.48% indicated Good or Excellent on the identified item. For the reporting cycle (F 2008 to SP 2009) graduates who completed the survey (N=65) 83.07% indicated Good or Excellent on the identified item.

M 9: Alumni Survey (O: 8)

85% of the alumni completing the alumni survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

Target for O8: Alumni Survey

85% of the alumni who complete the alumni survey will select 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being least prepared and 5 being most prepared in the program outcome: "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community".

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

In Spring 2009 access information for an online alumni survey was sent to all program graduates since 2002 (over 500). As a result, 24 individuals accessed and completed all or part of the alumni survey. Of these 19 or 79% selected 4 or 5 on the program outcome related to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community".

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

Alumni Survey

The real dilemma is alumni tracking, (as evidenced by a <5% response rate). 80% of respondents indicated a positive response to "integrating knowledge of self, science, and humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups, or the community." Again, this question will be reviewed for clarity. If multiple variables are contained in the same question, revision will occur. The Assistant Director for External Affairs will continue to develop a reliable data base for BFLSON graduates. Once a reliable data base is obtained and the question is reviewed for clarity, a repeat survey can be addressed. The graduates will be encouraged to become and stay engaged with the BFLSON. This will be accomplished by the continued publication of the bi-annual newsletter, and a potential social activity. New graduates will be encouraged to become and stay active with the BFLSON alumni group. For this to happen, an up-to-date reliable data base must be developed.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni Survey | Outcome/Objective: Alumni Survey

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year. This will give the Assistant Director for External Affairs time to develop a reliable data base.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Assistant Director for External Affairs
Additional Resources: A graduate assistant is requested to assist with the development and upkeep of the database. We request a graduate assistant for the fall, spring, and summer semesters.

Budget Amount Requested: $5,000.00 (recurring)

Critical Thinking Exam
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will evaluate the characteristics of the class of Fall 2008 to determine if they were significantly different from the class of Summer 2008 and Spring 2009 in aspects of GPA, number of course failures during the program, and success on the exit exam. The committee will determine if students need to continue to take a separate critical thinking exam, as the exit exam is an assessment of critical thinking. Perhaps the students are not motivated to achieve maximum success on a separate critical thinking exam.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam

Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON

Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 2080
NURS 2080 will develop clearer objectives related to this writing project. Consistent graders for each student’s paper will be initiated Fall 2009. All graders will meet in the beginning of the semester to discuss issues noted the previous semester. One instructor will review all papers for a consistent numeric grade.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: CTW NURS 2080
- Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: By the end of Fall 2009 semester, these changes will be in place.

Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty assigned to NURS 2080

Additional Resources: None at this time

CTW NURS 4600
We will continue to monitor the CTW assignment in NURS 4600 for continued achievement of target goal.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: CTW NURS 4600
- Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor for this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Nursing faculty assigned to teach NURS 4600

Additional Resources: None at this time

Evidence Based Practice
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this measure. Course instructors in NURS 3610 and NURS 3710 will be instructed to continue to require this writing assignment.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evidence based practice project
- Outcome/Objective: Evidence Based Practice

Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON

Additional Resources: None at this time

Exit Survey
This question on the exit survey will be reworded when the survey is revised the next time. It is the opinion of The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON that the graduates may not understand the intent of this question on the current survey. The committee will evaluate if the question(s) need clarification, or if there are too many variables, and the graduates may not understand what is being asked. Additionally by grouping the variables, if a student feels lacking on one variable, but not the others, they may answer negatively because of the one area lacking, and the other areas may not be lacking. The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will assess the questionnaire.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Exit Survey
- Outcome/Objective: Exit Survey

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON

Additional Resources: None at this time
Undergraduate Program

Additional Resources: None at this time.

Literature Search Committee
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the literature search activity.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Literature Search Activity Paper | Outcome/Objective: Literature Search Activity

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Additional Resources: None at this time.

NCLEX First Time Pass Rate
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON along with the Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program will continue to monitor the first time pass rate of graduating seniors. Graduates are encouraged to notify the school of NCLEX success.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Additional Resources: None at this time

Research Article Critique
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the article critique.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Research Article Critique | Outcome/Objective: Research Article Critique

Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON
Course administrators of NURS 3500
Additional Resources: None at this time

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
The Assistant Director for External Affairs needs additional help in order to assure a complete up-to-date data base for alumni. If a graduate assistant becomes available, the Assistant Director for External Affairs will work with this person to assure an up-to-date data base. The faculty and course administrators for NURS 2080, NURS 4600, NURS 3610, NURS 3710 and NURS 3500 will be included in the preparation of this report to assure they understand the significance of assignments in their respective courses for ease in the 2009-2010 report.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The course administrator of NURS 2080 has already met with all CTW writing assistants to clarify the expectation of the CTW paper.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The exit survey and the alumni survey need to be reviewed for clarity of the questions. If multiple variables are assessed in a single question, the question will be reworded to assure clarity. The course administrators for NURS 2080, NURS 3610, NURS 3710, NURS 3500, NURS 4600 and NURS 3500 will be included in the preparation of this report so that they can realize the importance of the assessment measures obtained from their respective courses.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing is to create a premier multicultural learning community that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery in Georgia and beyond.

Goals
G 1: Professional Commitment
Demonstrate professional commitment.

G 2: Legal and Ethical Issues in Advanced Nursing
Incorporate knowledge of legal and ethical issues in advanced practice nursing.

G 3: Theory as a Basis for Advanced Practice Nursing
Evaluate concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced practice nursing.

G 4: Advanced Practice Nursing in Specializations
Demonstrate behaviors consistent with the selected advanced practice role.

G 5: Assessment of Factors Affecting Healthcare
Analyze the influence of socio-political, economic, and ecological forces on nursing practice, health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers.

G 6: Activities for Improvement of Health
Initiate activities that promote nursing and the improvement of health and healthcare.

G 7: Integrating Knowledge into Practice
Integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in advanced practice nursing.

G 8: Collaboration in the Provision of Healthcare
Collaborate with individuals, families, communities and others for the purpose of providing nursing care and promoting health and wellness.

G 9: Participation in Research
Engage in research to support and promote nursing knowledge and to improve advanced practice nursing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Professional Commitment (G: 1) (M: 1)
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.

Relevant Associations: Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) National Organization of Nurse Practitioners; American Nurses Credentialing Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health); National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties

General Education/Core CurriculumAssociations
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
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: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing (G: 2) (M: 2)
100% of the students will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards
SLO 3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice (G: 3) (M: 3)
85% of the graduates and students will report that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing in advanced practice nursing.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

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

SLO 4: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4) (M: 4)
At end-of-program, 85% students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

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

SLO 5: Analysis of Various Approaches to APN Practice (G: 6) (M: 5)
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (G: 8) (M: 6)
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

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

SLO 7: Participation in Research (G: 9) (M: 7)
At the end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they were prepared/well prepared to implement evidence-based practice. 80% of the graduates (1-, 3-, and 5-years will indicated that they were prepared/well prepared to engage in research to improve nursing practice; 50%) of these graduates will indicate that they are engaged in research to support and improve nursing practice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

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

SLO 9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4)
At end-of-program, 85% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Practice in Specialty Area (G: 4) (M: 9)**
80% of the graduates of the master’s program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation; at end-of-program, 50% of the students will indicate that they have employment in their area of specialization upon graduation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 10: Scholarly Productivity (G: 1) (M: 10)**
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-years) will show that 20% of the graduates will be involved scholarly activities (i.e. publication in refereed journals; presentations at regional and national meetings, etc.)

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 11: Professional Membership (G: 1) (M: 11)**
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will show that 75% of the graduates (1-, 3-, and 5-years) will report membership in professional nursing organizations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (G: 5) (M: 12)**
At the 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, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.) (G: 7) (M: 8)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self,
science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice experiences.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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**

6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Professional Commitment (O: 1)**

At end-of-program, 91% (21/23) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Practice (O: 2)**

100% of the students enrolled in clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical practice as evidenced by the successful completion of the clinical practice portion of the courses.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 3: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice (O: 3)**

Only 66% (15/23) of the students reported they met/exceeded the criteria that they evaluated concepts and theories as a basis for advanced practice nursing; 97% (28/29) of the graduate respondents indicated that they met/exceeded the criteria that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced practice nursing.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 4: Demonstration of Caring in Nursing Practice (O: 4)**

At end-of-program, 90% (20/22) of the students indicated that they demonstrated caring in nursing practice.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 5: Analysis of Various Approaches to APN Practice (O: 5)**

At end-of-program, 86% (19/22) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (O: 6)**

At end-of-program, 77% (17/22) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others for the purpose of improving health.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 7: Participation in Research (O: 7)**

At the end-of-program, 71% (17/23) results showed that 87% (25/29) indicated that they agreed/strongly agreed that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice; however, only 28% (8/29) had been involved in research activities since graduation.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Sciences, Etc.) (O: 8)**

At end-of-program, 87% (20/23) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice experiences.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 9: Practice in Specialty Area (O: 9)**

The Alumni survey (1-, 3-, and 5-years) results showed that 72% (21/29) of the graduates were working in their specialty area. Of the eight that were not working in their specialty area, four could not find positions and four decided to seek employment in a different area. At end-of-program, 12% (3/24) had secured positions in their specialty area. Those who were seeking positions were considering employment in community health centers, and federally qualified health centers as well as clinics and private practice.

[Note: students usually do not attain an advanced practice nursing position until they become nationally certified (by examination).]

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 10: Scholarly Productivity (O: 10)**

Alumni survey (1-, 3-, and 5-year) results showed the following: 28% (8/29) had served as a consultant; 7% (2/29) had published in a refereed journal; 4% (1/29) had published in a non-refereed journal; 31% (9/29) had made a presentation at a professional meeting.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 11: Professional Membership (O: 11)**

Alumni survey (1-, 3-, and 5-year) results showed that 93% (27/29) of the graduates were members of a professional nursing...
organization (9 belonged to ANA; 16 belonged to Sigma Theta Tau International; 19 belonged to other organizations); 61% (17/28) indicated that they were actively involved in their professional organization(s); 14% (4/29) reported that they had held an elected office or been a member of a committee.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (O: 12)**

At the end-of-program, 66% (15/23) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

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

**Action Plan Development Following Master’s Program Evaluation**

An action plan will be developed at the completion of the full evaluation of the master’s program in December 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Practice in Specialty Area | Outcome/Objective: Practice in Specialty Area
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director for Academic Affairs; Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Action Plan Development Following Master’s Program Evaluation**

We will be developing an action plan following the completion of the full evaluation of the master’s program that should be completed in December 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director for Academic Affairs Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are in the process of a formal evaluation of the clinical master’s program. In the process of completing this process, we will address issues that were identified in this report as well as assess current trends in healthcare and nursing education in order to enhance the curriculum as needed. As we complete this process, we will develop a comprehensive action plan.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since the 2007-2008 there were no significant changes were made in the curriculum as we plan to implement a full evaluation of the master’s program and its clinical tracks in 2009-2010. Although not all goals were met, no immediate action was warranted. The 2008-2009 data from this assessment and other data (end-of-program survey; changes in the AACN Essentials Document for Advanced Practice Nursing; and an in-progress evaluation of the master’s program), we will be implementing changes as guided by the results of the evaluation. However, we determined that we needed a better tracking system to collect essential data regarding student course and clinical progress; therefore, we evaluated several programs that would assist us in collecting these data. The Typhoon program was selected and is being implemented in 2009-2010.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data presented in this program is just a part of the data we collect in evaluating our program for our credentialing body (Credentialing Center for Nursing Education [CCNE], the Georgia State Board of Nursing, the criteria for certification for our students, etc.). The accumulation of these data have directed us to look at some specific items wherein the students indicated that they would like more experience (e.g. suturing, xray interpretation, etc.) or did not feel as confident in their knowledge or practice. We are assessing these issues and discussing ways to strengthen their experiences in these areas.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

As noted above, we have implemented Typhoon tracking software to be better able to collect and manage student course and clinical progression and offer them an opportunity to develop a clinical portfolio for their personal use. In addition, we have developed a graduate resource room on uLearn to provide a localized area for student retrieval of important clinical and practice information. As we are in the first year of using Typhoon and the Resource Center, it is too early to determine how they will affect our outcomes.
However, these operational changes are streamlining our processes and providing better accessibility to data.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

This year’s assessment will be reviewed as part of the formal review of the master’s program which is in progress and expected to be completed in Fall 2010. Clearly this information will be useful as we examine our processes and outcomes.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Strategies to address the areas of concern identified in the end-of-program surveys have not been determined. However, the identified issues from this assessment as well as other pertinent data will be assessed during the formal review of the master’s program which will be concluded in December 2010.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Most Important Accomplishments for Year

1. Increased enrollment in the master’s programs.
2. Attainment of a HRSA grant to initiate the Nursing Leadership in Healthcare Innovations program that includes tracks in nursing administration and nursing informatics.

#### Challenges for Next Year

1. Managing increased enrollment with the current economic situation.

#### Modifications in Intended Outcomes

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Nursing PhD**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 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 is to create a premier multicultural learning community that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery in Georgia and beyond. The Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing will be nationally recognized for innovative, responsive, educational nursing programs focused upon diversity, urban healthcare, and vulnerable populations. The School will be noted for expert practitioners, community partnerships, and leading-edge research.

#### Goals

**G 1: Research Implementation**

Doctoral students will plan and implement nursing research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

**G 2: Theory Utilization**

Doctoral students will link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable populations.

**G 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations**

Doctoral students will analyze health promotion issues among vulnerable populations.

**G 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry**

Doctoral students will explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing.

**G 5: Scholarly Activities**

Doctoral students will complete scholarly activities such as grant submission, presentations at regional and national meetings, submission of an article for publication in a refereed journal, etc.

**G 6: Completion of PhD Program**

Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD in nursing.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Research Implementation (G: 1, 6)**

100% of the doctoral students who successfully complete comprehensive examinations will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
### SLO 2: Theory Utilization (G: 2)

90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NJRS 8040 Theory Construction course.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SLO 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (G: 3)

90% of the doctoral students will successfully link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations as demonstrated by successful completion of the NJRS 8100 Vulnerable Populations course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SLO 4: Application of Qualitative Research Methods (G: 1, 4) (M: 1)

90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NJRS 8035 Qualitative Research Course in which they apply skills of collecting qualitative data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</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>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SLO 5: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (G: 4)

90% of the students will successfully complete NJRS 8050 Quantitative Research Methods I and NJRS 8051 Quantitative Research Methods II in which they develop a quantitative research study proposal.

<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>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Submission of Manuscripts for Publication (G: 5)**

30% of the students who have completed the core courses will submit manuscripts, either independently or co-authored by faculty, for publication.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (G: 1, 5)**

30% of the students who have completed their comprehensive examinations will submit proposals for funding to support their doctoral dissertation research.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (G: 5)**

50% of the students who have completed the core courses will submit abstracts, either independently or co-authored with faculty, for scholarly presentations at professional nursing meetings.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 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
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Completion of the PhD Program (G: 6)**

80% of the doctoral students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**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: Qualitative Research Implementation (O: 4)**

85.7% of the doctoral students successfully implemented a pilot qualitative research study and analysis during NURS 8012 Qualitative Research Methods.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have not made any changes based on data from this assessment. We are satisfied with the progression of our doctoral students and their accomplishments.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

After making some changes to the learning outcomes from last year based on the request to focus on student accomplishments, we determined that the program outcomes from the doctoral program will need revision to reflect our new mission, vision, and philosophy.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Overall, we are satisfied with the status of the doctoral program and the progression of our students. We do not expect to make any changes based on this assessment at this time. However, we do anticipate a full evaluation of the doctoral program to be completed in 2010-2011.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

As noted above, we do not intend to implement any new strategies over the coming year. However, there will be a full evaluation of the doctoral program in 2010-2011 after which some changes may occur.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Nutrition BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Goals

G 1: Prepare dietetics professionals
Demonstrate knowledge necessary to become competent, entry-level dietitians who can function in a variety of settings.

G 2: Make effective use of resources in problem solving
Apply research principles to investigate and resolve issues related to the dietetics field as evidenced by problem-solving and critical thinking skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Communicate effectively (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Communicate effectively. The BS program in nutrition has bookend CTW courses -- NJTR 3010 and NUTR 4950. Additionally, the BS program has one Writing Across the Curriculum course -- NUTR 4400. Students also write in discipline formats in all required discipline courses and make major oral presentations in NUTR 3600, NUTR 4000, NUTR 4300, NUTR 4400, and NUTR 4950. 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
4 Critical Thinking

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

SLO 2: Apply management principles (G: 1, 2)
Apply knowledge of management principles and systems in planning, monitoring, and evaluating dietetic services and practice and implementing of quality improvement programs. This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VII.80-VII.98.
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written 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

### SLO 3: Demonstrate an understanding of nutrients (G: 1) (M: 2)
Demonstrate an understanding of the role of nutrients and food in human health, disease prevention, health promotion, and medical nutrition therapy. This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VI.63-VI.79.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written 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

### SLO 4: Utilize critical thinking skills (G: 2)
Utilize critical thinking skills in the interpretation and application of research methodologies. 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
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

### SLO 5: Describe impact of laws, regulations, and costs (G: 1)
Describe the impact of laws, regulations, and costs on health care systems and food and nutrition programs. This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes VIII.99-VIII.101.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills
- 7 Technology

### SLO 6: Demonstrate science understanding (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Demonstrate an understanding of the influence of chemical, microbiological, and physiological disciplines as they affect food and nutrition. 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

### SLO 7: Demonstrate promotion of healthy lifestyle (G: 1)
Demonstrate an understanding of the science of food and food policy in promotion of a healthy lifestyle and pleasurable eating in diverse population groups. This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes V.42-V.62.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

### SLO 8: Integrate social sciences (G: 1, 2)
Integrate psychological, social and economic aspects of the environment and examine how they individually and collectively affect food and nutrition. This outcome/objective encompasses Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) Learning Outcomes III.31-III.34.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Research Paper (O: 1)**

This paper is a component of the capstone Critical Thinking through Writing course (NUTR 4950). It is completed in stages, with two revision cycles. Originally, the paper was a group assignment completed by students in groups of 4-5 students. For 2010, the assignment was changed to an individual research paper since the group paper failed to identify individual progress from junior year to senior year. Students wrote the paper based on their primary research question. The paper had one revision prior to formulation of the final paper. Two components of the evaluation rubric are used for this evaluation: rationale and content. Each of these is evaluated on a scale of basic (0-2), proficient (4), and mastery (6). Rubric is located in depository.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Communicate effectively**

The target for organization is all students meet or exceed proficiency (4) with a mean class score of 5 or above.

The target for content is all students meet or exceed proficiency (4) with a mean class score of 5 or above.

These targets are set without benefit of baseline data because this is the first year of implementation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Thirty students completed the six group papers for NU 4950. For organization the final scores ranged from 5.8 to 6.0 with a mean score of 5.9. For content the final scores ranged from 4.8 to 6.0 with a mean score of 5.5.

**M 2: Discipline-specific Critical Thinking (O: 3, 6)**

Critical thinking is essential for dietetic practitioners. This CADE-accredited program focuses on preparing dietetic practitioners. The measure used for this assessment is direct measures of student performance on specific, critical thinking questions included on exams in junior courses (NUTR 3010, NU TR 3500, NU TR 3600, NU TR 3700) and senior courses (NUTR 3150, NU TR 3160, NU TR 4000, NU TR 4200, NU TR 4250, NU TR 4300). Approximately 20 questions from each year’s class exams will be selected. Half of these questions will measure application of knowledge about nutrients, and the other half will demonstrate science understanding. The expected mean score for the junior class is 75%, and the expected mean score for the senior class is 85%. While the content for the courses progresses from the junior year to the senior year, implying that the senior year is more difficult, program expectation is that critical thinking will improve as students are exposed to more examples of assignments that require critical thinking instead of rote memory.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrate an understanding of nutrients**

The expected mean score for the junior class is 75%, and the expected mean score for the senior class is 85%.

**Target for O6: Demonstrate science understanding**

The expected mean score for the junior class is 75%, and the expected mean score for the senior class is 85%.

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

**Expanded evaluation of writing**

Although students exceeded the target, we realize that this is only one measure and does not show progression from their entry to graduation. The rubric might have been compressed for grading purposes and might not evaluate the full range of performance. In the upcoming academic year we will apply the rubric to two courses, a junior course NU TR 3600 and the senior course NU TR 4950. The rubric will be revised for use in both courses. The evaluation process will entail selecting a random sample (30-35% of the class) of final papers from NU TR 3600 and conducting a paired comparison of those papers with papers from NU TR 4950 the following year. These comparisons will be made by a team of faculty evaluators who will not have access to the rating form completed by the instructors of these two courses. Data will be used to improve assignments and progression of assignments.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Begins Fall semester 2009 with NU TR 3600(juniors) and ends Spring semester 2011 (seniors) for the first cycle.
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** DPD Director
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The NU TR 3010 and NU TR 4950 CTW courses have made changes to the student assessment methodology from group position papers to individual position papers. The instructors are revising the assessment rubrics for both courses to make comparisons for
the ability to communicate in both courses. The instructors will randomly select 30% to 35% of the individual papers completed in NUTR 3010, NUTR 3600 and NUTR 4950 courses. Students' progress will be evaluated by a selected faculty committee made up of three members. This will be done in Fall 2010; junior papers and senior papers will be reviewed using the rubric to see if there are improvements in the ability to communicate effectively. Faculty members for NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 have met to revise the rubrics to assist comparing progression in communication skills between the junior and senior years.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Division of Nutrition continues to offer NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 CTW courses and NUTR 3600. The three courses are used by the division to evaluate the effective communication outcome. Previously NUTR 3010 was offered in the Fall and NUTR 3600 was offered the following Spring semester. This year both courses are being taught in the Fall semester, therefore the instructors have revised the written paper course assessment as outlined below.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The division faculty has realized the need to streamline the assessment methods used in the three courses in order to monitor student progress as they advance from one course to the other. NUTR 3600 has always required students to complete individual papers, while NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 have been requiring papers completed in groups. Faculty found that it was difficult to assess individual student performance on the group paper. Therefore, the division has plans to implement the changes outlined below.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Operations Management MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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: Develop a Strategic View of OM (M: 1, 2, 3)**

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**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)**

The Student should be able to identify critical success factors of the operations management activities of an organization. This includes the ability to correctly identify, analyze and select the appropriate decision in terms of the operations management function.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint (M: 5)**

The student should become aware of the impact that OM and Supply Chain decisions have on the environment and industrial substantiality. They should be able to select the appropriate solutions to OM problems in the environmental/substantiality framework

**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

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)**

The student should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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: Reasoned Analysis (O: 1)**

Evaluation of individual MS student's case and/or homework analyses will be completed. The individual work will be integrative in nature and will occur in the MGS 8710 course.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3

Measure 1: Reasoned Analysis The student is not able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student can determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at completing a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- 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. The understanding of the integrative nature of the Operation dimensions of an industry and the importance of strategic fit is well understood.

**M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Students should be able to determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic and integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 2 Integration of recommendations The student is not able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to integrate recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student excels at integrating recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry. The student easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

- Integrated recommendations: The results from the student group projects reflected a lack of reasonable integration in the changes being made inside the operations organization and the other disciplines.

**M 3: Performance (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE This measures the students' ability to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment through their ability to identify the critical success factors of an OM application and the assessment of available resources and capabilities.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Outcome 1 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student is able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student excels at identifying critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to easily assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students excel at analyzing or understanding how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

- Indentify critical success factors: The students continue to perform well on the analytical portion of their project work. They
also were able to foresee the changes that are needed in different economic circumstances.

### M 4: Critical Thinking (O: 2)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE X-NONE Evaluation of individual MS student’s work as completed in the required OM course. The accumulation of this type of knowledge will be received through the application of exam questions that will be measured overtime.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Develop Decision Making Abilities**

Student should pass each outcome/objective as indicated by satisfactory work on course exams.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

\[ x \]

### M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE X-NONE Will develop a focus and will highlight the effects that OM decisions have on the environmental and substantiality aspects of industry.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Leaning Objective 3: Develop a Environmental/Substantiality Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an excellent understanding of the environment impact of OM or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

None reported

### M 6: Team Skills (O: 4)

The student should develop and enhance their team skills in the completion of completing project work in the Operations Management area. This includes positive participation in group activities and the completion of work that is needed for the group's progress.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

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

#### A strategic view of OM

With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8710, add a homework assignment to ask students aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8710, add a case about operations making significant difference for a company’s long term growth. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### An Environment/Substantiality Viewpoint

With respect to the third learning outcome, develop an environment/substantiality viewpoint, two actions will be taken: · Add a homework assignment in MGS 8770 for the connection of OM theory and applications. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise in MGS 8770 requiring students to discuss the impact of OM and supply chain decisions on the environment and industrial substantiality. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Decision Making Abilities

With respect to the second learning outcome, to develop decision-making abilities, two actions will be taken: · In MGS 8710, ask students to add more analysis in students’ group project. Evaluate after next offering. · In MGS 8710, add several new measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the business environment: increased globalization. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Team Membership
With respect to the fourth learning outcome, to become a strong team member, two actions will be taken:  · Incorporate into teaching material for MGS 8710 and 8770 lessons on effective teams.  · Require team members in the group project of MGS 8710 and 8770 to create a team charter indicating an emphasis on the importance of cooperation and fairly distributed individual contributions.  Evaluate after next offering.

Additional Resources:

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Faculty will review each others’ syllabi and assignments to check for clarity and rigor. Faculty will convene regularly to discuss any new findings during the semester.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?  Why were these changes made?  What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We are placing more emphasis on the overall application of operations in the firm and its supply chain. We have refined, adapted, and expanded our rubric measures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data?  (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?)  If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We will be adding more illustrations and examples for our students to follow and spending more class time emphasizing concepts and research rather than facts. We will emphasize the importance of using companies where students are currently working for their projects so that students' career can benefit from the project.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)?  How have those changes affected your outcome?
We have moved to learning objectives that would measure individual performance rather than team performance. We have continued and increased the focus on the relationship between OM and the other functions within the organization, which includes highlighting OM and its overall performance. Further, we have placed more emphasis on the analysis of smaller details within the projects as well as on the overall picture of the process. These changes have been providing positive feedback with the achievement of rubric measures.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department?  What are the implications?  How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Our findings indicate that students coming to our programs may not be as prepared as we had thought in terms of research, writing, and detailed conceptual work. Some students have engineering degree with a strong analytical background while some students do not have such strong skill. This is useful information, as we have had to adapt our class times to working with our students more closely and doing more remedial work in class.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year?  What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will use more frequent “mini-assessments” in our classes to see if the new emphases in our classroom delivery are paying off. We expect a slow but steady improvement next year. We would like to see a 3-4 percentage point increase in the proportion of our students meeting expectations on all measures.
### Mission / Purpose
The MS in Change Management, aka Organizational Development (OD), is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to be a leader or a consumer of change management initiatives. The MS in Change Management extends the students' previously acquired basic management and organization behavior skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in applied change management practices. The MS in Change Management, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as change management specialists either as managers or as internal or external consultants. Topics include: negotiation, leadership, organizational change, and consulting.

### Goals
**G 1: None**
No goals have been set distinct from the Mission statement.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Understand and Integrate the Theoretical Bases (M: 1)**
The MS Change Management graduate will be able to understand and identify the relevant change management theories that can influence an organization's change management strategy.

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

**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
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

### Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Change Management Case Pre and Post Analysis (M: 3)**
Upon entry to the Change Management program, and as part of the completion of a formal program of study document, students will complete a brief written case analysis of a change management situation. The case analysis uses critical thinking question and answer format to elicit information. As such, it is easily scored. This same case will be analyzed by the student and scored by the faculty upon completion of the core requirements for the major. If the student has learned what we intended, his or her scores on the case analysis should improve considerably. Over time, this could potentially be a powerful enough metric to be the sole assessment criteria for the MS in Change Management Program.

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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: Theory Critique & Development (O: 1)**
Faculty members will give a Behavioral/Objectively Anchored scale rating with respect to the student's ability to create a change management model. This will be an external analysis of a course embedded measure. This project requires the student to reflect on all models in the OD field, choose the best and worst of all the models, and create a unique model that adds value to the field and to their ability to work in an OD environment. Models can be creative in nature often using metaphors and graphics.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### Target for O1: Understand and Integrate the Theoretical Bases
80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Theory Critique and Development Rubric to randomly selected Change Management Models produced by MS Change Management Students. The Change Management Assessment Committee will gather together to elect raters for each rating cycle. The rating score will be the average of two independent ratings. Rubric for Measure 1 (Model Assessment) Criteria for Effective Model Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3

Number 1: Model Makes Conceptual Sense Student creates a conceptual model that misses one or more fundamental aspects of change Student creates a conceptual model that captures one or more fundamental aspects of change Model is Cyclical in Nature or Reflects the Ongoing Nature of Change Student creates a model with a defined and finite end point Student creates a model with an implied repetitive or cyclical function Student creates a model with a defined and finite end point

Number 2: Criteria for Effective Model Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2

Number 3: Model Includes Both Internal and External Factors Student creates a model that omits important internal or external factors Student creates a model with most of the relevant internal and external factors Student creates a model with almost all of the relevant internal and external factors

Number 4: Model Demonstrates Ability to Logically Organize Change Management Variables Student creates a model with missing variables or variables out of place. Student creates a model with most of the relevant variables and with most variables in the correct place or sequence Student creates a
model with all of the relevant variables and with variables in the correct/logical place or sequence

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

**Scoring on Measure 1 (actual data) Criterion Student 1 Student 2 Average 1 2 3 2.5 2 3 2 2.5 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 1 2 1.5 Total 9 10**

### M 2: Intervention Assessment Critique (O: 2)
Faculty members will give an anchored rating on key factors with respect to the student's ability to explain, critique, and suggest applications for a specific OD intervention.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

### Target for O2: Change Management Intervention Assessment

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Change Management Intervention Assessment to written critiques of Change Management Interventions. The Change Management Assessment Committee will gather together to elect raters for each rating cycle. Ideally, the rating score will be the average of two independent ratings. Rubric for Measure 2 (Change Management Intervention Assessment) Criteria for Effective Intervention Analysis Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Number 1: Description of Change Management Intervention Student describes a change management intervention that fails to clearly articulate the basic aspects of how the intervention works. Student describes a change management intervention that clearly articulates the basic aspects of how the intervention works. Number 2: Nature of Use Student fails to identify when and how this intervention could be used Student is generally accurate in describing when and how this intervention could be used Student is completely accurate in describing when and how this intervention could be used Number 3: Potential Problems Student fails to articulate the potential problems inherent with this intervention. Student generally articulates the potential problems inherent with this intervention. Student fully articulates the potential problems inherent with this intervention. Number 4: Intervention Demonstrates Conceptual Depth in the Field of OD Through Overall Logic and Analysis of Intervention Student fails to cohesively present a logical analysis of an OD intervention. Student can cohesively present a logical analysis of an OD intervention. Student can cohesively present, in a sophisticated manner, a logical analysis of an OD intervention.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

**Scoring on Measure 2 (actual data) Criterion Intervention 1 Intervention 2 Intervention 3 Average 1 2 3 3 2.6 2 2 2 3 2.3 3 3 3 4 2 2 2 2 Total 9 10 11**

### M 3: Change Management Case Pre and Post Measures (O: 3)

An average improvement of 3 points per student. Measurement will be done by applying the Change Management Case Analysis to the pre and post written assessments of the “Change Management Case”. The Change Management Assessment Committee will gather together to elect raters for each rating cycle. The rating score will be the improvement between the two analyses. Example, at time one, student missed many of the conceptual points, failed to mention key problem areas, and missed a key opportunity for a successful intervention (Score = 3). Upon completion of the program, the student was able to successfully analyze the same case. (Score = 9), an improvement of 6 points.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

### Target for O3: Change Management Case Pre and Post Analysis

Rubric for Measure 3 (Change Management Case Analysis) Criteria for Effective Case Fails to Meet Standard = 0 Meets Standard = 3 Exceeds Standard = 5 Number 1: Identification of critical success factors in the case. Student fails to identify the key factors that can lead to the successful analysis of the case. Student identifies some of the key success factors that can lead to the successful analysis of the case. Student identifies most of the key success factors that can lead to the successful analysis of the case. Number 2: Anticipation of Roadblocks Student fails to identify potential barriers to change within the case Student identifies some of the potential barriers to change within the case Student identifies most of the potential barriers to change within the case Number 3: Problem Solutions Student fails to articulate the potential solutions to this case. Student generally articulates the potential solutions to this case. Student fully articulates the potential solutions to this case. Number 4: Model Demonstrates Conceptual Depth in the Field of OD Through Overall Logic and Analysis of Intervention Student fails to cohesively present a logical analysis of OD case concerns and theoretical fundamentals within the Change Management Discipline. Student cohesively presents a basic logical analysis of OD case concerns and theoretical fundamentals within the Change Management Discipline. Student cohesively presents a sophisticated logical analysis of OD case concerns and theoretical fundamentals within the Change Management Discipline.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

**Total**

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

#### Effective Communication

With respect to outcome four, the ability to communicate effectively through writing, this measure is just being developed and as such the following actions are being taken: Faculty will get together to discuss the importance of this outcome and how it might be measured. An adequate measure and rubric will be created

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OB Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Implementation
With respect to outcome three, the student's ability to improve in a pre and post measure of a Change Management Case Analysis (Pre and Post Analysis), three important actions will be taken: New students to the change management program will complete the pre assessment upon entry. Faculty will score the case analyses in the early spring. As data is gathered, modifications to protocol will be assessed.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Change Management Case Pre and Post Measures  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Change Management Case Pre and Post Analysis  
  
**Implementation Description:**
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OB Faculty Members  
- **Additional Resources:** None  
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Logical Analysis Emphasis**

With respect to the second outcome, the student's ability to assess and critique a Change Management Intervention, two actions will be taken: The Rubric will be updated and modified for ease of scoring. Item 4 needs clearer guidelines around the terms “logical analysis.” From the above data, it appears that the fourth criterion, Logical Analysis, should be reinforced and stressed as students evaluate OD interventions. While 2.0 is the target, and this target was met, it is dangerously close to not being met. This score can be substantially improved upon. This will happen in the OD class (MGS 8450) in the form of added course material, student discussion, and critique of interventions as a group.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Intervention Assessment Critique  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Change Management Intervention Assessment  
  
**Implementation Description:**
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OB Faculty members  
- **Additional Resources:** None  
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Theory Initiatives**

With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to “Understand and Integrate the Theoretical Bases of the Field of Change Management”, two actions will be taken: In MGS 8450, students will create models of the field and those models will be evaluated. Prior to evaluation, the rubric will be updated and modified for ease of scoring. Items 1 and 4 need clearer guidelines around the terms “fundamental aspects” and “change management variables. Rubric will be evaluated after next use. In MGS 8450, students will create models of the field and those models will be evaluated. Based on prior data, it appears that the fourth criterion, logical organization, should be reinforced and stressed as students create OD models. This will happen in the OD class (MGS 8450) in the form of added course material and examples of models that both consider and fail to consider this important factor. Effectiveness of this material will be assessed after the next scoring.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Theory Critique & Development  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understand and Integrate the Theoretical Bases  
  
**Implementation Description:**
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** OB faculty members  
- **Additional Resources:** None  
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

- Greater involvement of our assessment committee in evaluating the rubric and associated outcomes
- Doing a pilot test of our pre-post change management assessment.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Course material was added to MGS 8450 to address model development Peer evaluation of models was increased and formalized to assist in model development.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

- This year's findings indicate areas where we can add course material to strengthen a learning outcome, i.e., model development.
**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
- Peers are more involved in model development and evaluating each others work.
- Student learning objectives are reviewed and modified as needed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Overall we are doing a good job in MS Change Management. We will continue to seek ways to improve operationally.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will improve by adding more content and seeking more rigor from our students. We anticipate a .5 level of improvement in all areas rated less than 3.0.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2008-2009 Personal Financial Planning MS**
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
MS-PFP PROGRAM MISSION: The MS in Personal Financial Planning is designed to prepare students to: (1) Enter the field of financial planning at the planner level; (2) Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam; and; (3) Serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm. It will do so by developing students’ technical expertise in the topics of financial planning and their ability to integrate that expertise to help individuals plan their financial lives. The MS-PFP provides a more concentrated and in-depth consideration of financial planning topics than is offered by the MBA-PFP and thus better serves the needs of the those who are certain of their intent to pursue a financial planning career and assume a leadership position in a financial planning firm. RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION/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.

**Goals**
G 1: Enter the PFP field as a planner
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to enter the field of financial planning at the planner level.

G 2: Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to pass the Certified Financial Planner exam.

G 3: Prepare for leadership role
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

### SLO 1: Technical expertise - overall (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3)
The MS-PFP graduate will understand the 89 topics of the 2004 CFP Job Analysis at or above the level of an entry-level financial planner. This standard is set by the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- 1 Written Communication
- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 6 Quantitative Skills

### SLO 2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
The MS-PFP graduate will have the technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner in each of the six major technical areas of personal financial planning (i.e., Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) at or above the level of a beginning financial planner. This standard is set by
the related questions in the Certified Financial Planner exam administered by the CFP Board. A passing score on the exam is at least 60%.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**SLO 3: Identify a good client-planner fit (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**

The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to identify a good client-planner fit, and then gather and organize pertinent personal and financial client data to support an effective analysis of and plan for meeting the client's financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to evaluate critically his/her own financial planning strengths and weaknesses and, based thereon, be able to identify those clients and circumstances with which he/she will be most effective in providing advice and guidance.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking
7. Technology

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**

The MS-PFP graduate will have the ability to effectively integrate technical financial planning concepts to assist individuals with meeting their financial needs. The MS-PFP graduate will be able to integrate each of the major technical areas of PFP (Planning Fundamentals, Income Tax Planning, Insurance Planning, Investment Planning, Retirement Planning, and Estate Planning) by properly analyzing pertinent data, identifying financial needs, and developing objectives, strategies, and an appropriate action plan for meeting those needs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course) (O: 1, 2)**

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student takes a mock CFP exam. Relative performance across the areas of financial planning are measured, with feedback to the course work in the curriculum and to the design of PFP 8520 itself.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to select mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

An average of 1.5 was obtained on each of the criteria in the sample of mock exams. Fifty percent of the scores were 1.0, which does not meet the set target of less than 20%. See action plan.

**Target for O2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to select mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

An average of 1.5 was obtained on each of the criteria in the sample of mock exams. Fifty percent of the scores were 1.0, which does not meet the set target of less than 20%. See action plan.

**M 2: Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone) (O: 4)**

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a financial plan, acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts**
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to select Financial Plans submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

No criteria has a result below 2.0. Criteria one through three have an average of 2.5. The weakest result was obtained for criteria four (development of client action plan), which has an average of 2.0.

### M 3: CFP® Exam (O: 1)

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.

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**

CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The CFP® Exam pass rate for PFP program students and graduates in 2008-2009 was 75%, exceeding the national average of 60%.

### M 4: Planner File prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course (O: 3)

In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a file of supporting data and analyses, including an analysis of client fit in support of his/her financial plan.

**Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Identify a good client-planner fit**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE FOUR RUBRIC to select Planner Files submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

An average of 2.0 was obtained on criterion one. An average of 2.5 was obtained on criterion two.

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

#### Action plan based on Mock Exam

Our sample was based on one year’s data. The data collection process will be improved by keeping more complete records of exam performance by area in future years. The assessment committee will also rely more on quizzes given by area prior to the mock exam. The quiz material will be reinforced prior to comprehensive exam. All quizzes will be kept for a more complete assessment of performance by area.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course)
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Technical expertise - overall
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

#### Action plan for mock exam

Our sample was based on one year’s data. The data collection process will be improved by keeping more complete records of exam performance by area in future years. The assessment committee will also rely more on quizzes given by area prior to the mock exam. The quiz material will be reinforced prior to comprehensive exam. All quizzes will be kept for a more complete assessment of performance by area.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course)
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Technical expertise-major financial planning areas
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

#### Improve identification of client fit

Identification of client fit will be improved through the development and implementation of a more focused practitioner workshop series that emphasizes client selection and retention.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Reinforce strategies to improve client implementation**

Strategies will be reinforced to improve client to improve client implementation in PFP 8520. Role play exercises will be focused on implementation issues.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone)
- **Outcome/Objective:** Integrate technical financial planning concepts

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to improve the data gathering process and for a more complete assessment of student performance by area, copies of ALL quizzes will be kept and archived. For our capstone course, PFP 8520, exercises will be revised to have a greater focus on implementation issues. Likewise, a more focused practitioner workshop series will be developed that emphasizes client selection and retention.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have completely revised our learning outcomes assessment process, including the development of more direct measures based on stated criteria. Additionally, we have started tracking student performance on mock exams by area.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We need to improve our data gathering processes. For our capstone course, PFP 8520, role playing exercises must be further focused on implementation issues, while a more focused practitioner workshop series that emphasizes client selection and retention must be developed.
Improving Assessment Reporting

After the 2007-2008 Assessment Cycle, it was indicated to us that we should give more than numerical scores for the findings regarding various measures. Importantly, the faculty of the Department review the numerical data collected via the assessment process, but do not limit themselves to this (quantitative) data. We recognize its value, but also its limitations. Hence, our assessment of student learning is also informed by qualitative data such as our professional judgments about student papers and feedback about the classes that we receive from exemplary majors and our supplemental instructors. Nonetheless, in an effort to clarify what the numerical scores mean, the Assessment Coordinator will propose to the Department the following rubrics for the purpose of assessing philosophical skills (for 1010 and 2010), writing (for 1010), and content knowledge (for 2010). Philosophical Skills (1010 and 2010): When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 1.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide a fair and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their own theses, present an insightful and compelling argument, and consider possible objections and leave important points undeveloped. 1: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 2.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide charitable and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their own theses, present a reasonable compelling argument, and consider possible objections. However, work done by such students is not original, in that it does not go much beyond what was said in class and in the readings, and/or does not develop some important points fully enough. 2: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 3.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their theses, but this explanation is inaccurate in some important ways. Such students do demonstrate an ability to present an argument for a thesis, but their arguments are not original or compelling and they fail to consider possible objections and/or leave important points undeveloped. 3: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 4.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide a fair and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to offer a unified topic. Typically, they assert views but make virtually no attempt to defend those views; they often indicate a lack of understanding of the assignments. Writing (for 1010): 4: Papers assessed at a 4.0 for writing have a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and no significant grammar or spelling mistakes. They are polished, reflect excellent self-editing through multiple drafts, and display a sense of personal writing style, written in clear prose that is pleasurable to read. 3: Papers assessed at a 3.0 for writing have a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and very few grammar and spelling mistakes. They have been self-edited and do not read like a first draft. However, work done by such students is not original, in that it does not go much beyond what was said in class and in the readings, and/or does not develop some important points fully enough. 2: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 2.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to develop a proper thesis (even when they have a unified topic). Typically, they assert views but give little or no attempt to use arguments to defend those views. 0: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 0.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide no coherent explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to offer a unified topic. Typically, they assert views but make virtually no attempt to defend those views; they often indicate a lack of understanding of the assignments. Writing (for 1010): 4: Papers assessed at a 4.0 for writing have a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and no significant grammar or spelling mistakes. They are polished, reflect excellent self-editing through multiple drafts, and display a sense of personal writing style, written in clear prose that is pleasurable to read. 3: Papers assessed at a 3.0 for writing have a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and very few grammar and spelling mistakes. They have been self-edited and do not read like a first draft. 2: Papers assessed at a 2.0 for writing have a thesis statement and some organization of paragraphs, but overall do not flow. They contain a significant number of grammar or spelling errors and read like a first draft. 1: Papers assessed at a 1.0 for writing are poorly organized, with paragraphs that do not have a coherent structure. They contain numerous grammar and/or spelling errors and read like first drafts that have not been proofread. 0: Papers assessed at a 0.0 for writing are typically similar to papers assessed at a 1.0, but contains so many errors that it is not even possible to figure out what the very meaning of some sentences becomes ambiguous and hard to understand. Content (for 2010): 4: Students or papers assessed at a 4.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate an exemplary understanding of all of the texts discussed in the course, including subtle points that many miss. 3: Students or papers assessed at a 3.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate a good understanding of most of the texts discussed in the course, but miss subtle points. 2: Students or papers assessed at a 2.0 for their
content knowledge demonstrate a limited understanding of some of the texts discussed in the course, but miss not only subtle points but even basic points from some of the texts. 1: Students or papers assessed at a 1.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate lack of understanding of the basic points of most of the texts discussed in the course. 0: Students or papers assessed at a 0 for their content knowledge seem not to have any understanding of the basic points of the texts discussed in the course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew J. Cohen

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement? We will continue working as we have been, though we may have more discussion about topics required in Phil 2010.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have expanded the Assessment Committee. The restructuring of Phil 1010 is now complete.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We are doing well, but can improve the student learning, particularly in Phil 2010. We need resources to lower the limit on Phil 2010 from 60 back to 40. Phil 2010 is a worse course now than it was before the University converted to the semester system because the limit on the course was raised from 40 to 60. We had to essentially stop assigning papers and start giving multiple-choice exams. Discussion is difficult or impossible, and discussion is the center of philosophy. We thus need two additional lecturers in order to reduce the limits on Phil 2010. This will help us to improve the quality of the instruction the students receive and we would expect to see tremendous improvements in student learning. Additionally, too many sections of 2010 are taught by visiting faculty who standardly do not do as well as GA State regular faculty. We hence believe we need to have more sections of this course taught by regular faculty rather than visitors. We hence need funding for more regular (tenure track or lecturer) faculty.

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2008-2009 Philosophy BA**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Goals for Phil Majors**
Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in the English-speaking world 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 critical thinking skills and clear argumentative writing as with imparting information. We believe our major should do both and does do both.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 1: Content**
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
Critical Thinking

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
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Philosophy BA Learning Objective 2: Skills
Students majoring in philosophy are also expected to gain certain philosophical skills: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

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
6.1 Recruitment
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

CTW courses
We are looking hard at the first semester of required CTW assignments and would be surprised if changes to CTW assignments were not needed.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew J. Cohen

Split 4000/6000s
We are currently working on a proposal to split our 4000 level classes from our 6000 level classes (they currently meet together). We have reason to believe this will help improve graduate and undergraduate learning.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department. Needs Provost approval for additional funding.
Additional Resources: Additional tenure track faculty.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Philosophy MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

Goals

G 1: Goal for MA

Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in the English-speaking world 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 critical thinking skills and clear argumentative writing as with imparting information. We believe we can impart extensive knowledge of philosophical content as well as excellent philosophical skills to our graduate students and provide them the best philosophy MA education available in the country.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content (M: 1, 3)

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
1.14 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

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills (M: 2)

Students pursuing the MA in philosophy are expected to gain a higher level of the philosophical skills than graduates of the B.A. program attain. These include: the ability to read critically and with comprehension; the ability to think critically and to write clearly and persuasively; the ability to apply principles and techniques of logic to philosophical discussions; and the ability to conduct philosophical research effectively.

Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
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

6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 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

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content

Achievement Target: MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in content knowledge

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Findings (2008-2009) - Target: Met The average score on MA theses for content knowledge was 3.54. For 2007-2008, it was 3.82. For 2006-2007, it was 3.48.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Improving Assessment Reporting

After the 2007-2008 Assessment Cycle, it was indicated to us that we should give more than numerical scores for the findings regarding various measures. Importantly, the faculty of the Department review the numerical data collected via the assessment process, but do not limit themselves to these quantitative data. We recognize its value, but also its limitations. Hence, our assessment of student learning is also informed by qualitative data such as our professional judgments about student papers. Nonetheless, in an effort to clarify what the numerical scores mean, the Assessment Coordinator will propose to the Department the following rubrics for the purpose of assessing philosophical skills and content knowledge. Philosophical Skills: 1. When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 1.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has demonstrated ability to: provide accurate and adequate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their own theses, present an insightful and compelling argument, and consider and respond to viable objections. Work done by such students demonstrates original thinking, going beyond what was said in class and in the readings. 2: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 2.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has demonstrated ability to: provide a fair and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their theses, present a reasonably compelling argument, and consider possible objections. However, work done by such students is not original, in that it does not go much beyond what was said in class and in the readings, and/or does not develop some important points fully enough. 3: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 3.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has demonstrated ability to: provide an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their theses, but this explanation is inaccurate in some important ways. Such students do demonstrate an ability to present an argument for a thesis, but their arguments are not original or compelling and they fail to consider possible objections and/or leave important points undeveloped. 1: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 4.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has demonstrated ability to: provide little or no explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to develop a proper thesis (even when they have a unified topic). Typically, they assert views but give little or no attempt to use arguments to defend those views. 0: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student seems able to: provide no coherent explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to offer a unified topic. Typically, they assert views but make virtually no attempt to defend those views; they often indicate a lack of understanding of the assignments. Content 4: Students or papers assessed at a 4.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate an exemplary understanding of all of the texts discussed in the course, including subtle points that many miss. 3: Students or papers assessed at a 3.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate a good understanding of most of the texts discussed in the course, but miss subtle points. 2: Students or papers assessed at a 2.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate a limited understanding of some of the texts discussed in the course, but miss not only subtle points but even basic points from some of the texts. 1: Students or papers assessed at a 1.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate lack of understanding of the basic points of most of the texts discussed in the course. 0: Students or papers assessed at a 0 for their content knowledge seem not to have any understanding of the basic points of the texts discussed in the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle: 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: 2009-2010 Assessment Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion Date: 12/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Andrew J. Cohen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Measure for both Outcomes

The Assessment Coordinator will propose the following: As an additional piece of evidence regarding how the Department succeeds in teaching our grad students both content and philosophical skills, we will determine the percentage of those students that applied to the PhD program for which we have evidence they graduated with a MA. We define acceptance into a PhD program as any evidence indicating that the student applied to the program. This will give us a more complete picture of the success of our Philosophy MA program.

**Findings** (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met For the 2008-2009 academic year, we had 7 MA graduates apply to PhD programs. All were accepted to at least one school. (One was accepted to 4 schools and two were accepted to 2.) The acceptance rate is thus 100% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills. (Eight graduates did not apply to PhD programs.)

**M 2: MA Philosophical Skills (O: 2)**

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

**Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project**

**Target for O2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills**

**Achievement Target:** MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in philosophical skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met The average score on MA theses for philosophical skills was 3.32. For 2007-2008, it was 3.57. For 2006-2007, it was 3.28. For 2005-2006, it was 3.12.

**M 3: Acceptance into Phd Program (O: 1)**

As an additional piece of evidence regarding how the Department succeeds in teaching our grad students both content and philosophical skills, we determine the percentage of those students that applied to PhD programs from January through December of the preceding year who were admitted to those programs. Preparing students for PhD programs is part of our mission and acceptance to such programs is a clear sign that we are creating quality MAs; this is to say that this is a clear sign that our MA graduates have content knowledge and philosophical skills.

**Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other**

**Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content**

**Achievement Target:** We hope that any of the students who graduate with an MA who wish to continue on to a PhD program are accepted into a program they will thrive in. We set, as a realistic target, 75%.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met For the 2008 calendar year, we had 7 MA graduates apply to PhD programs. All were accepted to at least one school. (One was accepted to 4 schools and two were accepted to 2.) The acceptance rate is thus 100% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills. (Eight graduates did not apply to PhD programs.)

**Findings (2008-2009) - Target: Met**

Findings (2008-2009) - Target: Met The average score on MA theses for philosophical skills was 3.32. For 2007-2008, it was 3.57. For 2006-2007, it was 3.28. For 2005-2006, it was 3.12.
PhD programs from January through December of the preceding year who were admitted to those programs. Preparing students for PhD programs is part of our mission and acceptance to such programs is a clear sign that we are creating quality MA's; this is to say that this is a clear sign that our MA graduates have content knowledge and philosophical skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Current Assessment Cycle  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2009

**Split 4000/6000s**  
We are currently working on a proposal to split our 4000 level classes from our 6000 level classes (they currently meet together). We have reason to believe this will help improve graduate and undergraduate learning.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department. Needs Provost approval for additional funding.  
**Additional Resources:** Additional tenure track faculty.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will continue working as we have been, though hoping to receive institutional support to improve the funding of the graduate students and to split our 4000 and 6000 level classes.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have expanded the Assessment Committee.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are doing well, but can improve the student learning by separating our 4000 level classes from our 6000 level classes. The difference in motivation, preparation, and ability between our graduate students and our undergraduate majors has grown as the research profile of the Department has improved. We recruit outstanding graduate students from across the U.S. and around the world. When a class is composed of these students and our undergraduate majors, the difference in level is too much. Four additional tenure-track faculty (or two additional tenure track faculty and one lecturer or two additional lecturers) would allow us to split our 4000 and 6000 level courses and thus dramatically increase the quality of learning at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. We also realize that our graduate students are far too underfunded and far too overworked. Many receive either a mere $6000/year or an even lower $4000/year. Of those beyond their first year, most teach between 1 and 3 sections per semester of Phil 1010 for $2000 per section. This pitiful situation adversely affects the learning of our graduate students.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Physical Therapy DPT**  
**(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)**

**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: 120 graduate students were enrolled in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program in Fall of 2008. Forty-one doctors of physical therapy graduated in August of 2009.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: Professional Behaviors**

The six comprehensive assessments of professional behaviors on the Clinical Performance Instrument for the Physical Therapy Student (questions 1-6 addressing Safety, Professional Behavior, Accountability, Communication, Cultural Competence, and Professional Development).

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**M 3: Licensure Exam Pass Rate**

The National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate for the program (first time and ultimate)
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**M 4: Clinical Skills**
The clinical skills as measured by the student's performance on measures 8 - 18 on the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) for the physical therapist student, developed by the American Physical Therapy Association. Outcomes include Screening, Examination, Evaluation, Diagnosis and Prognosis, Plan of Care, Procedural Interventions, Educational Interventions, Documentation, Outcomes Assessment, Financial Resources, and Supervision of Personnel.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 5: Research Project**
Progressing over a two year period, student's engagement in a research project will result in 1) a manuscript for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, and 2) a poster/platform presentation at a regional or national meeting.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 6: Comprehensive Exams**
A comprehensive examination will be administered at the completion of each year.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

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

**Cardiopulmonary Instructor**
Transition teaching responsibilities in Cardiopulmonary PT course to a licensed PT with advanced credentialing as a Cardiopulmonary Care clinical specialist.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Division Head

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Physics and Astronomy teaches a number of courses in the University Core. Introductory physics and astronomy courses may be either terminal sequences or preparation for additional courses or professional degree programs. The mission of the department in introductory science courses is to provide the students with the ability to understand and analyze their world by making use of the theoretical and practical tools of science, in particular physics and astronomy. The mission of these courses is to:

a) provide foundational knowledge of the workings of the physical world,

b) allow students to develop the ability to perform reasoning and analysis from a scientific perspective,

c) teach both conceptual and practical knowledge of physical processes, and

d) enhance the students abilities in applying mathematical or technological tools in their analysis. Where these courses serve as prerequisites to upper division courses or professional degree programs the department also seeks to give the students the content knowledge and skills required to succeed in those courses or programs.

**Goals**

**G 1: University Learning Outcome - Critical Thinking**
Among the skills developed in introductory science sequences such as those taught in the department of physics & astronomy are those identified by the university as important in all areas of study and fields of preparation. The department supports those learning outcomes by integrating them into the goals of its Area D science courses. Once of these learning outcomes is critical thinking. As applied to the introductory science courses, critical thinking is closely related to the ability to understand and apply the scientific process.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking (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
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Conceptual Short Essay Exam Questions in Physics (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. The exam questions and scoring rubrics can be found at Phys1111/1112 and Phys2211/2212.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**

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%.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed physics courses. Based on data from 585 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.1 out of 10 and 61% of the answers had a score of 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 411 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.0 out of 10 and 56% of the answers had a score of 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 179 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.3 out of 10 and 54% of the answers had a score of 5.0 or higher. Based on data from 130 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 7.1 out of 10 and 75% of the answers had a score of 5.0 or higher.

#### M 2: Multiple Choice Questions on Astronomy Final Exams (O: 1)

A set of core questions is included on final exams in every section. These questions stressed physical, spatial, and quantitative reasoning. A sample of the multiple choice questions used can be found at Astr1010.

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from 249 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 51%. Based on data from 164 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 56%.

### 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: Conceptual Short Essay Exam Questions in Physics | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking
  - Measure: Multiple Choice Questions on Astronomy Final Exams | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

- **Implementation Description:** September 30, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms/Department Assessment Committee

#### Evaluation of Phys1111/1112 Interventions

A number of changes have been made to the delivery of Phys1111/1112 classes including new faculty, new textbook, and an innovative "studio" physics learning environment. In addition to the critical thinking assessment, a number of other evaluation methods are being used to determine the success of these innovations. Included in these is the use of standard assessment instruments developed in the field of physics education research. An IRB approved research effort is underway.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Conceptual Short Essay Exam Questions in Physics | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

- **Implementation Description:** These evaluations will be completed by the end of the Spring 2010 term with analysis to occur over Summer 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms and John Evans
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department has made major changes in its delivery of the courses that result in the bulk of its credit hours in physics. This year is a year to assess the results of these changes and determine if the desired improvements in student learning are occurring. The parallel research efforts related to these changes should complement the critical thinking assessment to give the department a clear picture of their success.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Over the last two years the department has concentrated its efforts on its largest Physics classes in the core, Phys1111 and Phys1112, as is reflected in last year’s action plan. In Spring of 2008, the department hired a full professor with research emphasis on physics education. This faculty member is teaching primarily in the Phys1111/1112 sequence and working on innovative teaching methods in these classes. In addition, two lecturers have been hired (one started in Fall 2008 and the other Fall 2009) who teach exclusively in these courses. Both are knowledgeable and experienced in physics education research proven techniques and pedagogy. In 2008 a faculty group met to re-evaluate the curriculum for these courses. This group factored the results of the assessments of critical thinking into their work. This led to the adoption of a new textbook for the sequence. In parallel with these efforts, a new "studio" style classroom was constructed (500 Classroom South). This room has 6 round tables accommodating 9 students each. The room is used primarily for Phys1111/1112 and courses are taught as combined lecture and lab using interactive and inquiry driven pedagogy. This style of class has been phased in as instructors have been trained in this style of teaching. For the 2009/2010 academic year about half of the students taking Phys1111/1112 will be taught in this new classroom using a studio physics approach. The department expects to see improvements in many of its learning goals for these students, including critical thinking, due to these interventions. The 2009/2010 assessment will be the first year in which good data will be available. Two research projects are also being performed related to these interventions, both funded initially by STEM Faculty Fellows program at GSU. One of these projects has applied for and received IRB approval.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings for this year are very similar to the last few years. Although we are meeting our targets, we believe our courses should be doing a better job of developing student’s critical thinking skills. The innovations in Phys1111/1112 over the last year should result in improvements in critical thinking assessment scores for 2009/2010.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Physics BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics and Astronomy offers a bachelor of science in physics. In addition to the standard program in physics, concentrations in Applied Physics, Astronomy, Pre-Medicine, Biophysics, Geology, and Computer Science are available. All bachelor degrees are constructed around a core of upper division physics and math courses which cover the core subject matter for a degree in physics. All physics majors also complete upper division lab and research requirements. In addition to the physics content, instruction in scientific reasoning, scientific writing, and technology are emphasized. The mission of the program is quite broad since students go on to many different career paths. Half of physics majors nationally go to graduate school in some field including physics, math, chemistry, engineering, medicine and law. The other half pursue careers which include research & development, business, technical sales or support, K-12 education, and many others. Due to the rigor of a physics degree program, the overwhelming feature of a student with a physics degree should be the ability to think clearly and apply scientific reasoning. The mission of the B.S. in physics program is to prepare students for a wide variety of fields and activities which require analysis, critical thinking, and the application of physical principles and scientific critical thinking to new situations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Physics Content Knowledge and Application Skills**

Students receiving a B.S. in physics should understand the core principles of physics, usually divided into the areas of classical mechanics, electricity & magnetism, statistical & thermal physics, and quantum physics. In addition students should be able to apply appropriate mathematical tools to set-up and solve quantitative problems using those core principles.

**G 2: Skills of a scientist**

Students receiving a B.S. in physics should demonstrate the skills and abilities needed to use their scientific knowledge and problem-solving skills in a collaborative, technological environment.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
SLO 1: Classical Mechanics (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in classical mechanics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

SLO 2: Electricity & Magnetism (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in electricity & magnetism and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

SLO 3: Statistical & Thermal Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in statistical & thermal physics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

SLO 4: Quantum Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in quantum physics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

SLO 5: Scientific Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 2, 3)
Students collaborate effectively with other students in a laboratory setting as they perform physics experiments.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration

SLO 6: Research Implications (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology and express them in laboratory reports.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 7: Scientific Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 2, 3)
Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report laboratory experiments. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 8: Scientific Communication (G: 2) (M: 2, 3)
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication

SLO 9: Scientific & Research Technology (G: 2) (M: 2, 3)
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluations in Content Courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
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. The criteria for each course are found at Classical Mechanics, Electricity & Magnetism, Statistical & Thermal Physics, Modern Physics I, and Modern Physics II.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Classical Mechanics
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Seven physics majors completed Phys4600, Classical Mechanics. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.00 out of 5. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.86 out of 5.

**Target for O2: Electricity & Magnetism**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Three physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity & Magnetism. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 5.00 out of 5. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.67 out of 5.

**Target for O3: Statistical & Thermal Physics**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
Ten physics majors completed Phys3850, Statistical & Thermal Physics. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.10 out of 5. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.70 out of 5.

**Target for O4: Quantum Physics**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Eight physics majors completed Phys3401, Modern Physics I. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.75 out of 5. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.75 out of 5. Seven physics majors completed Phys3402, Modern Physics II. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.72 out of 5. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.42 out of 5.

**M2: Laboratory Reports in Advanced Physics Labs (O: 5, 7, 8, 9)**

Normal 0 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and are available here.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Scientific Collaboration**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Four physics majors completed Phys3901, Modern Physics Laboratory I. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 5.00 out of 5 for scientific collaboration.

**Target for O7: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Four physics majors completed Phys3901, Modern Physics Laboratory I. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.44 out of 5 for scientific critical thinking.

**Target for O8: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Four physics majors completed Phys3901, Modern Physics Laboratory I. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.25 out of 5 for scientific communication.

**Target for O9: Scientific & Research Technology**
Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Four physics majors completed Phys3901, Modern Physics Laboratory I. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.63 out of 5 for scientific & research technology.
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. Criteria for assessment can be found here.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O5: Scientific Collaboration

Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This assessment was not performed in 2008-2009 but will be performed again using new capstone research and CTW course in 2009-2010.

### Target for O6: Research Implications

Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This assessment was not performed in 2008-2009 but will be performed again using new capstone research and CTW course in 2009-2010.

### Target for O7: Scientific Critical Thinking

Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This assessment was not performed in 2008-2009 but will be performed again using new capstone research and CTW course in 2009-2010.

### Target for O8: Scientific Communication

Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This assessment was not performed in 2008-2009 but will be performed again using new capstone research and CTW course in 2009-2010.

### Target for O9: Scientific & Research Technology

Target performance is 4.0 which represents substantial understanding out of 5.0 maximum which corresponds to mastery.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

This assessment was not performed in 2008-2009 but will be performed again using new capstone research and CTW course in 2009-2010.

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

#### Implementation of Assessment in CTW courses

The program's two CTW courses are being taught for the first time this year. These two courses replace courses previously used as major parts of our assessment of student learning outcomes. The assessments are being migrated over to the new courses. The interplay between CTW assessments and learning outcomes assessment is being worked out. Phys3300, the new lab course, is being taught for the first time in the Fall of 2009. Phys4900, the new research class, is being taught for the first time in Spring 2010. Since most of our upperclassmen are under the older catalogs, many will still complete the older research class (fewer credit hours and less externally supervised written work). Since the program is relatively small, the performance of the assessments while students are split between two different research requirements creates some unknowns in our assessment which will only be revealed in the spring term.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  

**Implementation Description:** New courses are being taught for the first time over the 2009-2010 academic year. Phys3300 is being taught in Fall 2009 and Phys4900 in Spring 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms
Investigations regarding majors math skills
Since we have measured lower than desired performance at times over the last three years in the application of knowledge in some core content classes, we will examine the prerequisite math, actual math skill level, and instructor expectations in the core content classes. Through this we will discover if instructor expectations are appropriate and also search for changes in curriculum or pedagogy to address this issue.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: Classical Mechanics
- Measure: Electricity & Magnetism | Outcome/Objective: Quantum Physics | Statistical & Thermal Physics

Implementation Description: Since some of our core content courses are taught in the fall and some in the spring, these investigations will take place over the 2009/2010 academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

Pilot project for calculus and physics
Physics majors are prepared for upper division courses by taking 2000-level courses in physics and math. In particular, majors take the calculus-based introductory physics sequence, Phys2211/2212. They are currently required to take one calculus course (Math2211) before they take Phys2211. This calculus course has a high withdrawal and failure rate that sometimes results in delaying majors in their degree progress. In addition, instructors in both the intro sequence and the upper division courses have concerns about the math skills of the students after passing Math2211 (and higher courses). One of the concerns is whether majors can take the pure skills they learn and apply them to physical situations where variables represent physical quantities. In order to help both the math and physics programs to understand the interplay between the calculus skills and the physics applications, we are developing a pilot project. In this project students will be taking Math 2211 and Phys2211 in the same semester with the two courses taught in the same room, one after the other, with a 45 minute break between classes. The instructors for the math and physics class will coordinate their material and be aware of what the students are learning in the other class. This should allow the students to better connect the math operations to their meaning in physical systems. It should also allow the instructors to identify disconnects between the math and physics approaches to these skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: Classical Mechanics
- Measure: Electricity & Magnetism | Outcome/Objective: Quantum Physics | Statistical & Thermal Physics

Implementation Description: The pilot project with paired physics and math courses will be taught in the Spring of 2010.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Vadim Apalkov

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our pilot project involving Phys2211 and Math2212 is being developed by instructors for each course. Our assessments in CTW classes are being worked out as the courses are taught for the first time. Investigations into the math skills of our majors are planned.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The main focus of the efforts within the BS in Physics has been the creation of two new courses to serve as CTW classes. These classes replace the lab and research classes that have been used in our assessment. The new courses, Phys3300 (Advanced Physics Laboratory) and Phys4900 (Research Project) are being taught for the first time in 2009/2010. We have a small number of majors and there is a transition as students from older catalogs finish, both the old and the new research class will need to be used for assessment for the next year or two.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

No data was collected for our present capstone research class this year, although steady improvement had been observed over the previous three years. Steady improvement has also been observed in the assessments for the upper division lab. We expect that the introduction of three credit hour CTW courses to replace both the upper division lab and the capstone research class will continue this trend. In the content courses there were some missed targets relating to the application of core knowledge. We interpret this to indicate a mismatch between the students math skills and instructor’s expectations. This is consistent with the previous three years results. We are using this to examine the math skills of our majors and are investigating ways to address the issue.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Physics MS
Mission / Purpose
Coming Soon

Goals
G 1: Coming Soon
Coming Soon

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2, 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: 4, 5, 6)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 4, 5, 6)
Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

SLO 5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 4, 6)
Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics.

SLO 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2, 3, 5)
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I (O: 5)
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 which can be found at Astronomy Qualifying Exam I Assessment Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Five students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I. The average rating for Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.7 out of 5.0.

M 2: Astronomy Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)
Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (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 which can be found at Astronomy MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
One student was rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
One student was rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
One student was rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 5.0 out of 5.0.

**M 3: Physics Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)**
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 which can be found at Physics MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 3.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 3.8 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
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 which is part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average rating for Motivations and Implication of Research was 4.1 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 3.9 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average rating for Scientific Communication was 3.8 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their research paper. Average rating for Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.1 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)**

Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (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 which is part of the Astronomy MS Committee Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.0 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 5.0 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.0 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific &amp; Research Technology was 4.0 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Physics Presentation and General Examination (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

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 and are part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Motivations and Implication of Research was 3.5 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 3.7 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O4: Scientific Communication
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Scientific Communication was 3.1 out of 5.0.

Target for O5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Two Physics M.S. students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 3.9 out of 5.0.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assessment Committee Review and Report
The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the M.S. students in both the physics and the astronomy track. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2007/2008 there was a low score in one outcome for the astronomy track (based on 8 students) but high scores in all areas for the physics track (based on 3 students). In 2008/2009 there were quite high scores in all outcomes for the astronomy track (based on 5 students) but low scores in many areas for the physics track (based on 2 students). When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Scientific Communication
- Scientific & Research Technology
- Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Motivations and Implications of Research
- Physics Committee Research Paper
- Motivations and Implications of Research
- Scientific & Research Technology
- Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Physics Committee Research Paper

Implementation Description: Assessment Committee will present results at a faculty meeting in the Fall of 2009, at the chairman’s discretion.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Since the action plan is a review and report nature, accomplishing involves scheduling only.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 No changes have been made since last year. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2007/2008 there was a low score in one outcome for the astronomy track (based on 8 students) but high scores in all areas for the physics track (based on 3 students). In 2008/2009 there were quite high scores in all outcomes for the astronomy track (based on 5 students) but low scores in many areas for the physics track (based on 2 students). When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

These findings reflect a pretty healthy MS program with two tracks. Although in a given year the assessments may show low scores in a particular area, those same scores are often much higher in the previous or next year. It is apparent that this is due to the small numbers of students and an individual student may greatly affect the scores. When the numbers are low, the department is typically...
working with a student to address the issues producing the low scores. Since each situation is different, it seems wise to deal with the students with low skill levels on an individual basis and not create any new structure.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Physics PhD**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coming Soon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Coming Soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming Soon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Collaboration in Scientific Research (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 3, 4)** |
| Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology. |

| **SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 3, 4)** |
| Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions. |

| **SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4)** |
| Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia. |

| **SLO 5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 3, 4)** |
| Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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. 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 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2)** |
| Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 and can be found in the Physics Qualifying Exam Evaluation Forms for Classical Mechanics, Electricity &amp; Magnetism, Statistical Mechanics, and Quantum Mechanics. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Seven students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Physics Qualifying Exam. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.4 out of 5.0.

| **M 2: Research Advisor Evaluation (O: 1, 4, 6)** |
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 and are the first section of the advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 5.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**M 3: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
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 and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Sixteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Sixteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Sixteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.4 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Sixteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**M 4: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
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, 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 and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Motivations and Implications of Research**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills**

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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.7 out of 5.0.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**

The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in physics. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2007/2008 there was a low score in two outcomes (based on 5 students). In 2008/2009 there were quite high scores in all outcomes (based on 3 students) including the two outcomes which had low scores the previous year. When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good. Therefore, the departmental assessment committee will not be recommending any changes in either the assessment methods or the curriculum at this time.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
- Measure: Physics Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Research Advisor Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Measure: Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication

**Implementation Description:** Assessment Committee will present results at a faculty meeting in the Fall of 2009, at the chairman's discretion.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Since the action plan is of a review and report nature, accomplishing involves scheduling only.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No changes have been made since last year. It is clear based on several years of data that the small numbers of students in a given year result in large year to year variations. For instance, in 2007/2008 there was a low score in two outcomes (based on 5 students). In 2008/2009 there were quite high scores in all outcomes (based on 3 students) including the two outcomes which had low scores the previous year. When averaged over a number of years, performance in all outcomes is reasonably good.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

These findings reflect a pretty healthy PhD program in physics. Although in a given year the assessments may show low scores in a particular area, those same scores are often much higher in the previous or next year. It is apparent that this is due to the small numbers of students and an individual student may greatly affect the scores. When the numbers are low, the department is typically working with a student to address the issues producing the low scores. Since each situation is different, it seems wise to deal with the students with low skill levels on an individual basis and not create any new structure.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Political Science Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission of the Department of Political Science’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 the United States and the state Georgia government institutions and behavior and by imparting an appreciation of political issues from a global perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Substantive Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks student learning outcomes of substantive knowledge and understanding about American and Georgian government commensurate with the performance of citizenship duties and the stability of an effective civil society and to recognize 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 2: Analytic Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks to improve basic analytic skills through the core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: Communication Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks student learning in oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Substantive Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First learning outcome: Students should demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of American and Georgian government commensurate with the performance of citizenship duties and the stability of an effective civil society. Specifically, students should have a fundamental knowledge of constitutionalism, federalism, separation of powers, civil liberties, and the electoral process. Second learning outcome: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Analytic Skills (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: Communication Skills (M: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner, and draw logical conclusions from findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Substantive Knowledge (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning the first learning outcome (American and Georgia government), students should be able to pass exams involving these concepts. The Department will review syllabi and exams from PolS 1101 classes (Introduction to American Government) to ensure that students are being successfully taught these concepts in this required class that emphasizes these concepts. It also will collect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data involving the overall pass rate for these classes. Concerning the second learning outcome (the universality of politics in human experience and appreciation of political issues from a global perspective), students should be able to pass exams demonstrating the political nature of global issues. The Department will review syllabi and exams from PolS 2401 (Global Issues), a required class in which this outcome is addressed, to ensure that the outcome is being addressed successfully. It also will collect data involving the overall pass rate for these classes. 

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge**

The first targeted performance level is passing. The department seeks passing rate of better than 90 % passing (Grade of “D” or better). The second targeted performance level is average grade. The department seeks an average grade of 75 % or better. The Third targeted outcome is common knowledge. The department seeks each student understand the answers to a series of questions that demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of American and Georgian government commensurate with the performance of citizenship duties and the stability of an effective civil society. Specifically, all students should have a fundamental knowledge of the US and Georgia constitution, federalism, separation of powers, civil liberties, and the electoral process and 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

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Regarding final grades, the target of 90% passing was met in the vast majority of the classes and the target of the average grade of 75 % was achieved in all sections (20 sections in fall 2008 and 16 in spring 2009 semester). Of the 36 sections of PolS 1101, over 90% passing was achieved in 32 sections, or more than 88% of the sections. Similar results were found for PolS 2401 Key q. The average grades for PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 are exactly that: average (i.e., right in the middle “C” to low “B” range overall). The average grade across all sections has increased slightly from 81% (2.6) in the fall semester to 82% (2.7) in the spring semester, and the overall percentage of students passing has increased from 92% in the fall semester to 94% in the spring semester. Additionally, both the percentage of students withdrawing and of students failing the class has decreased from 4.5% to 3.6% and from 8.2% to 5.4% respectively. Of course we have not to measure these results on a time-series basis. However, we can conclude that the course grades seem to conform to a normal distribution curve. The average grade of 75 % was achieved in all sections for PolS 1101, and PolS 2410.

**M 2: 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).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Analytic Skills**

The department seeks passing rates of 75% or better on ten key questions asked on examinations for both PolS 1101, American Government and PolS 2401, Global Issues

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

PolS 2401 Global Issues 1 Intern, Conventions 87.57% 2 tragedy of commons 82.94% 3 Kyoto Accords 98.82% 4 Classic Trade theory 86.29% 5 US Iraq war 82.74% 6 International Law 72.88% 7 UN Charter 94.92% 8 Collective Security 82.71% 9 UN Security Council 80.23% 10 Intl Court of Justice 86.44%

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

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The assessment of this learning outcome is conducted in the same manner as goal above, involving an evaluation of class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

The department seeks evidence that student learning is geared towards developing effective oral and written communication skills. The department seeks evidence of this through examination of course syllabi

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Examined syllabi for both PolS 1101 and PolS 2401 focus on the development of student communication skills. Students must adopt 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 of record.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We seek additional supplemental instructors and a revision of existing syllabi and teaching of core courses

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Greater use of supplemental instructors and greater instruction of graduate student teaching assistants

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We need greater resources and an examination of both core courses to more effectively utilize GTA's. PolS 2401 is currently undergoing substantial review and if successful, PolS 1101 will follow.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We have redesigned tests and questions and added a dedicated instructor for American Government.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

It gives us greater impetus to redesign the core course curriculum.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Redesign of curriculum is the key strategy. It might take at least one year for changes to be implemented and work.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2008-2009 Political Science BA**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONENONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

**Goals**

G 1: Understanding, Thinking and Analysis
The goal of the BA program in Political Science is for all students to 1) Demonstrate basic understanding of institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally 2) Learn to think critically, write logically and coherently about these institutions and behavior 3) Learn basic methodological skills to be able to analyze numeric information and perform basic quantitative analyses.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Substantive Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 4)**

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 2. 2. Substantive Knowledge—Structures and Processes: Students should demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non-govermental 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 3.

**SLO 2: Methodological Skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 5)**

3. Methodological Skills: Appropriate to the Major: 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.

**SLO 3: Effective Communication (G: 1) (M: 2)**

1. Effective Communication: 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.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: Analytical Skills (G: 1) (M: 3)**

1. 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. Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Measures (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. Students in International Affairs take PolS 3200, Comparative Politics and PolS 3400, International Relations, while student in Pre Law take the introductory course of PolS 3140, Judicial Politics and Process. Instructors in all four of the above classes were asked to evaluate student outcomes on the following five (5) point scale, with five (5) representing the highest level of learning outcomes and one (1) the lowest. The instructors rated each student in the following subject areas: oral communication, analytic ability, writing ability and overall knowledge/mastery of the subject matter. The instructors in PolS 3800 were asked to evaluate the methodological learning outcomes for each student, in addition to the above. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates a lack of knowledge/ability 2. Demonstrates basic knowledge/ability 3. Demonstrates understanding 4. Demonstrates competency 5. Demonstrates mastery

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge**

The Department seeks that students demonstrate understanding of the subject matter. The department seeks average learning outcomes of three(3) or better in each area of substantive knowledge

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Substantive Knowledge global institutions and behaviors: PolS 3200: 4.09 PolS 3400 4.05 Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes, American Institutions and Behaviors: PolS 3140: 4.28

**Target for O2: Methodological Skills**

The department seeks average student outcome in methodological skills of three (3) or better in PolS 3800, Introduction to Data Analysis

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major PolS 3800: 3.43

**M 2: Effective Communication (O: 3)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE 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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Effective Communication**

The Department seeks average student outcomes of three (3) or better, indicating understanding of effective oral and written communication

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**


**M 3: Analytic Skills (O: 4)**

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. Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O4: Analytical Skills

The Department seeks average student learning outcomes of three (3) or better, indicating understanding of basic analytic skills

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

PolS 3140: 3.91  
PolS 3200: 4.22  
PolS 3400: 4.05  
PolS 3800: 3.24

### M 4: Substantive Knowledge (O: 1)

Students should demonstrate an understanding of comparative perspectives and the international system. The department seeks syllabi that conform to these requirements and that The Department seeks that students understand the material Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes The Department seeks evidence that syllabi in Area G 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 seeks that students demonstrate understand the subject matter

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge

The Department seeks average student outcomes of three (3) or better indicating understanding of global issues and behaviors and United States and state of Georgia structures, institutions and behaviors

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

PolS 3140: 4.28

### M 5: Methodological Skills (O: 2)

1. 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O2: Methodological Skills

The Department seeks average student learning outcomes of three (3) or better, indicating basic understanding of methods and quantitative analysis.

#### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Methodological Skills Appropriate to the Major PolS 3800: 3.43

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

#### Improved Advising

The Department of Political Science continues to prioritize improvements in undergraduate advising. Working in tandem with the A&S Office of Academic Assistance, Political Science has developed a system of assigning faculty advisors to all majors. Early and sustained interaction with advisees should yield improvements in students' ability to navigate the major, course selection, and exposure to extracurricular opportunities (internships, study abroad, and the like).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Additional Resources:** The Department’s approved Action Plan (2008) provides for the hiring of a staff academic advisor. Funds for that position have not, however, been released.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

All students are required to take Pol S 3800, the department hopes to add enough instructors to limit class size to 25 or fewer students in accordance with CTW requirements. This should aid in the development of this critical, but difficult to master, skill.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department changed the reporting system moving to direct measures of student outcomes and now puts greater emphasis on critical writing and thinking skills in preparation for the coming CTW required courses.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
While the department goals for all categories were met, that is each category showed that the average student achieved a basic understanding/skill level (i.e., in no category did the average fall below 3), it is clear that the department needs to emphasize writing skills, particularly in integrating numeric data.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We have now added direct faculty evaluation of student outcomes, and eliminated grades as any sort of measurement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings give direct measurement of where we need to concentrate to improve student learning outcomes.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Our first goal is to limit class size in the CTW classes. That should enable much greater direct faculty and student interaction and help to develop and improve learning outcomes.

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of Political Science offers comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline’s major fields—American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration and Policy, and Political Theory—the programs are designed to produce scholars and practitioners who are experts in their substantive field of study and who are able to combine theoretical sophistication with methodological rigor. MA students can pursue a general program in Political Science or specialize in American Politics, Comparative Politics/International Relations, Professional Political Practices, or a dual MA in International Business and Government. The Department’s mission is to simultaneously (1) fill a much-needed niche in the Atlanta area and in the region for a strong terminal Master’s program and (2) provide the proper research foundation for those excellent students who wish to continue on for a PhD.

**Goals**

**G 1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills**
MA students should demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

**G 2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature**
Students should demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.

**G 3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings**
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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**
MA students should demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

**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: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.

**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

**SLO 3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings (G: 3) (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate the ability to write a professional research report or thesis in their area of specialization indicating ability to formulate research questions, to synthesize such questions with appropriate literature, to utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s), and to analyze data so as to answer the question(s) and raise additional questions.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The members of each MA thesis committee or of a non-thesis paper will individually assess the student’s achievement in terms of the program's stated learning objectives.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Eleven thesis projects and ten non-thesis projects were completed this year (summer 2008 through spring 2009). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis or non-thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met each of the department's stated learning objectives to a high or very high degree, with no score averaging lower than 4 on a scale of 1-5. Among these were some theses that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU. At the lower end of the spectrum, one thesis averaged a 3 on all five objectives. The non-thesis papers also met the department's learning objectives, with the exception of two outliers. Both of those projects were turned in at the last possible minute and the students had failed to work closely with their committees as prescribed by regulations implemented this year that set early deadlines for first and final draft submissions to committees.

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Eleven thesis projects and ten non-thesis projects were completed this year (summer 2008 through spring 2009). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis or non-thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met the department's stated learning objective to a high or very high degree, with no score averaging lower than 4. Among these were some theses that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU. One thesis averaged a 3 on all five objectives. The non-thesis papers also met the department's learning objectives, with two outliers. Both of those projects were turned in at the last possible minute and the students had failed to work closely with their committees as prescribed by regulations implemented this year that set early deadlines for first and final draft submissions to committees.

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Eleven thesis projects and ten non-thesis projects were completed this year (summer 2008 through spring 2009). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis or non-thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met the department's stated learning objective to a high or very high degree, with no score averaging lower than 4. Among these were some theses that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU. One thesis averaged a 3 on all five objectives. The non-thesis papers also met the department's learning objectives, with two outliers. Both of those projects were turned in at the last possible minute and the students had failed to work closely with their committees as prescribed by regulations implemented this year that set early deadlines for first and final draft submissions to committees.

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

**2-draft requirement**

Last year we implemented a two-draft requirement for all non-thesis papers, requiring the first draft to be turned in just after mid-semester, at the same time as the defense date for thesis papers. Based, admittedly, on a limited amount of data, we think this has helped improve the quality of the non-thesis papers and will continue this requirement.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: This is continued from last year.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director, non-thesis committee members
Additional Resources: none

Pre- and post-tests for methods sequence
For next year, we plan to strengthen our assessment capacity for the graduate programs by implementing a pre-test and post-test for students in our required methods sequence, POLS 8800 (fall) and POLS 8810 (spring). 8800 teaches research design, while 8810 is intermediate applied statistics. Because we must do this in order, the first pre-test will be given in Fall 2010, and the first results will not be reported until June 2011. The Graduate Director will work with the instructors of these two courses to come up with appropriate pre- and post-tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Normally the same person teaches 8800 on a regular basis, and the same is true for 8810.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will give the first pre-test in August 2010, the last post-test in April 2011, and report results in June 2011.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Grad director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.
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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.

Goals
G 5: Teaching Effectiveness
Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

G 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization
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.

G 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
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.

G 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
Students should demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

G 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
The student should demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major field of expertise.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 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 (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students should demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

---

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)**

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.

---

**SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (G: 4) (M: 2, 3)**

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.

---

**SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (M: 4)**

Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)**

Based on the program's learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are normally offered twice a year, in December and May. This academic year, a total of 8 students...
M 2: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

The Department’s goal is for students to be able 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Six doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from summer 2008 through spring 2009). Based on assessments completed by each student’s dissertation committee, all but two of the dissertations met the department’s goal of scores of 3.5 or better on the 5 point performance scales established for each of the five learning objectives. Most scored 4.5 or better on each of the learning goals. Of the two dissertations that received marks below the bar on some questions, both had low scores were on objective 4 (to what extent does the dissertation show mastery of a second field). One of these dissertations was otherwise exceptionally strong, and this student has published in refereed journals and now has a tenure track job at a research university. The second dissertation was generally weaker, and also demonstrated problems with objective 2, (research competency and familiarity with a broad range of methods). Three of the dissertations averaged 4.5 or better on combined scores for this assessment.

Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

It is the Department’s goal 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

While still in the acceptable range, scores on this dimension (high level of competency in research methods) have tended to be slightly lower than scores on the other dimensions of our rubric for dissertations.

Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization

It is the Department’s goal 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Six doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from summer 2008 through spring 2009). Based on assessments completed by each student’s dissertation committee, all but two of the dissertations met the department’s goal of scores of 3.5 or better on the 5 point performance scales established for each of the five learning objectives. Most scored 4.5 or better.
or better on each of the learning goals. Of the two dissertations that received marks below the bar on some questions, both had low scores were on objective 4 (to what extent does the dissertation show mastery of a second field). One of these dissertations was otherwise exceptionally strong, and this student has published in refereed journals and now has a tenure track job at a research university. The second dissertation was generally weaker, and also demonstrated problems with objective 2, (research competency and familiarity with a broad range of methods). Three of the dissertations averaged 4.5 or better on combined scores for this assessment.

**M 3: 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Fourteen doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year, including ten who received departmental funding to do so. There are four forthcoming publications by doctoral students, three of which are in refereed journals. Four MA students presented their work at professional conferences this year. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized a successful conference at Georgia State on building political institutions. Fifteen GSU graduate students, as well as students from other institutions, including the University of Denver, Old Dominion, Leicester University and Emory University, participated on five panels. Audience members included undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event. Doctoral students also applied for several external dissertation grants, including applications to Fulbright, Social Science Research Council, and United States Institute of Peace.

**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 should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year, including ten who received departmental funding to do so. There are four forthcoming publications by doctoral students, three of which are in refereed journals. Four MA students presented their work at professional conferences this year. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized a successful conference at Georgia State on building political institutions. Fifteen GSU graduate students, as well as students from other institutions, including the University of Denver, Old Dominion, Leicester University and Emory University, participated on five panels. Audience members included undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event. Doctoral students also applied for several external dissertation grants, including applications to Fulbright, Social Science Research Council, and United States Institute of Peace.

**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fourteen doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year, including ten who received departmental funding to do so. There are four forthcoming publications by doctoral students, three of which are in refereed journals. Four MA students presented their work at professional conferences this year. In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized a successful conference at Georgia State on building political institutions. Fifteen GSU graduate students, as well as students from other institutions, including the University of Denver, Old Dominion, Leicester University and Emory University, participated on five panels. Audience members included undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event. Doctoral students also applied for several external dissertation grants, including applications to Fulbright, Social Science Research Council, and United States Institute of Peace.

**M 4: Teaching Effectiveness (O: 1, 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.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

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.

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Thirteen instructors taught a total of 32 sections in summer, fall, and spring of 2008-09. Five instructors taught five sections in summer 2008, 12 instructors taught 13 sections in fall 2008, and 12
instructors taught 14 sections in spring 2009. Sections ranged from large 1000 and 2000 level courses with more than 100 students per section to 3000 level courses with 50 students or fewer. Syllabi were examined and found to be substantially in compliance with departmental, College and University standards. The average score for overall teaching effectiveness (question 17) was 4.3 for POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics) and 4.0 for POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Several instructors received lower marks than is normal for our graduate student instructors on this question, including a couple of new instructors. The departmental coordinators for POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 are formulating a plan to work with these students to improve their teaching effectiveness.

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

Continue to fund grad student conference travel
Budget permitting, the department will continue to offer financial support to students for travel to conferences to present their work. Last year, we were able to offer students $250 per conference for a total of two conferences per student per year. This year we had to cut that back to one per student per year at $250.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Conference presentations, publications and grants | Outcome/Objective: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director, department chair

In-house teaching prep course for grad student instructors
The department will develop an in-house course required of all PhD students and open to MA students, before they are assigned a course of their own to teach. The course will cover basic pedagogical topics as well as techniques for effective teaching of some of the substantive material in POLS 1101 and POLS 2401, the two courses most often taught by graduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Teaching Effectiveness
Implemention Description: Maymester
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Grad director, course instructor
Additional Resources: Ideally, we could have funds dedicated for this course to be taught each Maymester.

Pre- and post-tests in required methods sequence
To strengthen our ability to assess and teach competency in research methods, we will implement pre- and post-tests in our two required methods courses, POLS 8800 (Elements of Research Design) and POLS 8810 (Applied Intermediate Statistics). These courses are taught each fall and spring respectively. The Graduate Director will work with the two instructors (each course is normally taught regularly by the same instructor) to come up with appropriate tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Because it makes sense to collect data following the course sequence, we will implement this measure in August 2010 and report first results in June 2011.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations | Outcome/Objective: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
Implemention Description: Because it makes sense to collect data following the course sequence, we will implement this measure in August 2010 and report first results in June 2011.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(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: 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 2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (Final) (M: 1)
That students apply economic, financial, and psychological theories to interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems

### SLO 3: Assurance Skills (M: 4)
0: Assurance skills (Final) That students provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts

### SLO 4: Analytical Skills (M: 3)
That students present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions

### SLO 5: Collaboration Skills (M: 6)
That students contribute to collaborative efforts to achieve team

### SLO 6: Communication Skills (M: 5)
That students demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant

### SLO 7: Assurance Skills
That students provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts

### SLO 8: Technological Skills (M: 7)
That students demonstrate the technology skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Financial Reporting Skills - Interpret and Predict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A mean score of 80% or above on selected exam questions related to this Objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (O: 2)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8410
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (Final)**
Performance on exam questions in Acct 8410

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
The average score on selected exam questions pertaining to this objective over the two semesters was 84%.

#### M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1)
Performance on exam questions in 8410.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Financial reporting skills: Develop**
Performance on assignments in Acct 8410

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
A mean score of 80% or above on selected exam questions related to this Objective. The average score on selected exam questions pertaining to this objective over the two semesters was 75%.

#### M 3: Analytical Skills (O: 4)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**
10/13/2008 Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) Assurance skills 2005-2006 0: Analytical skills (O:0) (Final)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700

#### M 4: Assurance Skills (O: 3)
Performance on assignments in Acct 8610
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**
The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The students' performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected.

M 5: Communication Skills (O: 6)
At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
In both Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, all complaints against group members were satisfactorily resolved, and all projects submitted with all group member names included. All projects were submitted on or before deadline.

M 6: Collaboration Skills (O: 5)
Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
In both Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, all complaints against group members were satisfactorily resolved, and all projects submitted with all group member names included. All projects were submitted on or before deadline.

M 7: Technology Skills (O: 8)
Grading rubric used to evaluate the technology skills component of a group project in ACCT8410
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
The average score on the technology skills component of the project was 90%.

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

Action plan for Financial Reporting - Develop
Test this objective using cases and financial accounting standards database.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Department subscription to FASB Accounting Standards Codification: Professional View. Annual subscription is $150 for department allowing free access to students and faculty. SOA Director has agreed to subscribe to this database.
Goals

G 1: -
- 

G 2: -
- 

G 3: -
- 

G 4: Goal
To prepare advanced counseling students to provide clinical services to an array of populations and needs.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Implementation of specific theories in practice. (M: 2, 3)
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).

O/O 1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others (M: 2, 4, 5)
Process ethical dilemmas and lead others in supervision for successful resolution and toward the implementation of an intervention.

O/O 2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA (M: 2, 3, 5)
Training and application of ethical guidelines pertinent to the establishment, conducting, and group outcome for various types of groups are acquired.

O/O 3: Apply group theory through research. (M: 2, 4)
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.

O/O 4: Co-leader functions (M: 2)
Co-leadership functions pertain 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.

O/O 5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Adjunct structure is to acquire learning in the utilization of different group formations, interning in community actions and needs and community resources for this development.

O/O 6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (M: 3, 4, 9, 10)
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.

O/O 7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis (M: 4, 5, 10)
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.

O/O 8: Advocate for the profession. (M: 1, 8, 11)
Advocate by demonstrating actions that will further the identity and respect for the counseling profession.

O/O 9: Share knowledge with professional community. (M: 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 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.

O/O 10: Implement advanced counseling skills. (M: 2, 6, 7, 10)
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.

O/O 11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship. (M: 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10)
Work with individuals and groups to effectively lead groups and affect change in the counseling relationship.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Involvement in a community and or profession activ (O: 8, 9, 11)
Students will demonstrate through participation in activities related to community involvement through the Student Affiliate Organization (SAO) Chi Sigma Iota or one of the departmental student organizations. This participation can be in local, state, and national
organizations (community).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O8: Advocate for the profession.**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in at least one of the following: research, conference presentation, community outreach, or assist in the administration of conferences.

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in at least one of the following: research, conference presentation, community outreach, or assist in the administration of conferences.

**Target for O11: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students reported involvement in at least one of the following: research, conference presentation, community outreach, or assist in the administration of conferences.

**M 2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA (O: 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11)**

Training and application of ethical guidelines pertinent to the establishment, conducting, and group outcome for various types of groups are acquired.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O4: 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
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O10: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**Target for O11: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.5 on the 5.0 rating scale of the Student Learning Outcome Inventory.

**M 3: Apply group theory via research (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.3 on the assessment.

**Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.3 on the assessment.

**Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.3 on the assessment.

**Target for O6: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4.3 on the assessment.

**M 4: Co-leader functions. (O: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11)**
Co-leadership functions pertain 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Apply group theory through research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.8 on this scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (O: 1, 2, 5, 7)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.6 out of a possible. 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students averaged 4.6 out of a possible. 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students averaged 4.6 out of a possible 5.0.

**Target for O7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.6 out of a possible 5.0.

**M 6: Form 1010 Supervisor's Evaluation (O: 9, 10)**

Form 1010 (1-6 rating) evaluates the intern’s effectiveness skills in general supervision, counseling process, and conceptualization.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum rating of 3.0. The average for the students was 5.4.

**Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.**

90% of the students will achieve a 3.0 rating or greater on Form 1010.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the minimum rating of 3.0. The average for the students was 5.4.

**M 7: CPS 8430 Experiential Mastery of Skills (O: 9, 10, 11)**

Students will successfully demonstrate the intentional use of basic counseling skills, motivational interviewing, case conceptualization and treatment planning is an essential component of effective counseling.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**

Students will successfully develop and present a paper for advanced relationship skills for client interventions and remediation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.9.

**Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.**

Students will successfully develop and present a paper for advanced relationship skills for client interventions and remediation.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.9.

**Target for O11: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the 3.0 level of performance. The average for the students was 3.9.

**M 8: Residency participation in profession (O: 8, 9)**

Students are required to engage in a research or clinical residency completing successfully two or more professional residency activities.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O8: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students fulfilled the residency requirements. The average for the students was 4.1 professional activities.

**Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students fulfilled the residency requirements. The average for the students was 4.1 professional activities.
**M 9: CPS 8450 (O: 6, 9, 11)**

Students will successfully participate (attendance) in an experiential part of CPS 8450

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 91% on the learning assessment.

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 91% on the learning assessment.

**Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.**

90% of the students will attend all sessions and score a 75% on experiential learning.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attended and participated in a didactic and experiential learning assessment. The overall success was 91% on the learning assessment.

**M 10: Project for clinical relevance to crisis. (O: 6, 7, 9, 10, 11)**

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and 100% successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O7: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and 100% successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and 100% successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O10: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and 100% successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

**Target for O11: 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
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
95% of the students met the minimum pass of 75% and 100% successfully attained the Certified program for suicide assessment.

M 11: Implementation of specific theories in practice (O: 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).
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O8: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of the students met the minimum requirement of 3.0. The average for the students was 4.4

Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of the students met the minimum requirement of 3.0. The average for the students was 4.4

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

Ed.S. Action Plan
Provide more individualized feedback by faculty on the development and completion of the Residency Plan.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Faculty will implement this change by the commencement of Spring semester of 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brian J. Dew, Coordinator of Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Our strategies for the 2009-2010 year will be consistent with those efforts implemented in 2008-2009.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Due to the fact that our program met 100% of the goals, both in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years, no changes have been implemented. Furthermore, there were no specific objectives established in 2007-2008 that were to be implemented in 2008-2009.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The results of this year’s assessment supports the department’s efforts that we are preparing well-skilled counselors to work in a variety of community based settings. Furthermore, given these results, no changes to the curriculum are needed.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
NONE.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
These findings support the department's approach to use faculty from diverse programs to teach our specialists students. We will continue to allow our Ed.S. students to learn from professors with expertise in select fields, regardless of program affiliation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Faculty will come together more often (at least 3 times per year) to review the progress of our Ed.S. students.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
100% of Ed.S. students eligible for residency completed their paperwork and turned all forms into Dr. Levy.

**Challenges for Next Year**
Department will provide enough electives in Fall and Spring semesters in order for students to matriculate through the Ed. S. program.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
None

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
None

**University-wide Committee Participation**
All faculty members in the MS Professional Counseling Program teach in the Ed.S. program as well. Therefore, please see comments found in the M.S. in Professional Counseling report.

**Publications and Presentations**
All faculty members in the MS Professional Counseling Program teach in the Ed.S. program as well. Therefore, please see comments found in the M.S. in Professional Counseling report.

**Academic Teaching Activities**
All faculty members in the MS Professional Counseling Program teach in the Ed.S. program as well. Therefore, please see comments found in the M.S. in Professional Counseling report.

**International Activities**
All faculty members in the MS Professional Counseling Program teach in the Ed.S. program as well. Therefore, please see comments found in the M.S. in Professional Counseling report.

**Contributions to Student Retention**
Select Ed.S. students were invited to teach select undergraduate courses and receive feedback on their teaching skills.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2008-2009 Professional Counseling MS**
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling. (M: 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 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.

**O/O 2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18)**
Students will demonstrate the acquisition of the knowledge for the principles and problem solving methods to practice the ethical code.

**O/O 3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research (M: 2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18)**
Students will gain an understanding of professional expertise through conducting and facilitating program evaluation and research efforts.

**O/O 4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment (M: 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18)**
Students will acquire skills to understand and implement career assessment behaviors as a counselor.

**O/O 5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations. (M: 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional behaviors as they serve and function in counseling and consulting with diverse population

**O/O 6: Effectively works with groups of clients. (M: 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional skills as they work individually and with groups of clients.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Internship Membership in ACA (O: 7)**
90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the practicum-internship students enrolled during the 2008-2009 academic year (n=65) actively joined ACA.

**M 2: National Counselor’s Examination (O: 2, 3, 8)**
90% of the students 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 programs.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students 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 programs.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
92% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of the students 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 programs.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**
90% of the students 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 programs.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
90% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

**M 3: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**
Ethics application skills are integrated into each of the 12 subtests on the CPS Comprehensive Examination. The 150 questions assess for the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for best client care. The pure ethics questions comprise 10% of the examination that pertain to client care.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of all students (71 out of 76) who took the comprehensive exams in the Fall and Spring semesters (2008-2009 academic year) achieved a 70% or higher score on the Professional section.

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**

90% of the students will achieve 70% correct on the Professional sub-total of the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**M 4: Departmental Comprehensive Examination (O: 2, 4, 8, 9)**

The CPS Departmental Comprehensive Examination (150 questions) has one subscale (12 items) assessing knowledge of developmental information.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

90% of the program's students will score 72% on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**
90% of the program's students will score 72% on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

90% of the program's students will score 72% on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**

90% of the program's students will score 72% on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students (70 out of 77) who completed comprehensive examinations in the 2008-2009 year (Fall and Spring) scored 72% or higher on the developmental knowledge subscale.

**M 5: Form 1015: Written and Oral External Evaluation (O: 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

The end of year external site reviewers evaluate the intern's written and oral communications skill and demonstrated effectiveness in the acquisition of behavioral identity and behaviors related to best client care (to include case presentations and record keeping).

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**

90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**

90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**

90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**

90% of the students will achieve a rating of 3.0 (1-5 scale) or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.
**M 6: Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for effectiveness. (O: 1, 2, 6, 8, 9)**

Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for counseling effectiveness in interviewing for data collection and in assessing for client needs through the counseling process and conceptualization (2 scales).

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**

90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns scored 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. In fact, the average score among all practicum-internship students was nearly 5.0 (4.98).

**Target for O2: 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.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns scored 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. In fact, the average score among all practicum-internship students was nearly 5.0 (4.98).

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**

90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns scored 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. In fact, the average score among all practicum-internship students was nearly 5.0 (4.98).

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns scored 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. In fact, the average score among all practicum-internship students was nearly 5.0 (4.98).

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**

90% of the interns will attain an average of 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the interns scored 3.0 or higher on the 6.0 scale. In fact, the average score among all practicum-internship students was nearly 5.0 (4.98).

**M 7: Form 1015 (1-5 Scale) for effectivenes re: ethics. (O: 2, 5, 8)**

Students will be rated by on-site supervisors for effective application of ethics in client care.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the intern in the 2008-2009 academic year achieved a minimum or greater than a 3.5 on the ethics scale in Form 1015.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**

95% of the students will achieve an overall minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 on-site assessment on Form 1015.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the internship program received a rating of 3.0 or greater on the written and oral evaluations by site supervisors.

**M 8: Comprehensive Examination Appraisal Subtest (O: 1, 2, 4, 8)**

Appraisal subtest on the 150 departmental examination contains 12 questions relative to appraisal in vocational, educational, and psychological assessment.
Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS departmental examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 72% or higher on the appraisal subtest.

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS departmental examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 72% or higher on the appraisal subtest.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS departmental examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 72% or higher on the appraisal subtest.

Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.
90% of the students will score 72% or greater on the appraisal subtest of the CPS departmental examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 72% or higher on the appraisal subtest.

M 9: Form 1015 Clinical Reasoning (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8)
Form 1015 Clinical reasoning tests for knowledge in assessment and interpretation of educational, psychological, social, and career. This scale is a 1-5 rating with less than 3.0 rated as ineffective.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the internship program (Spring 2009) received a 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning subscale of Form 1015.

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the internship program (Spring 2009) received a 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning subscale of Form 1015.

Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the internship program (Spring 2009) received a 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning subscale of Form 1015.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the internship program (Spring 2009) received a 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning subscale of Form 1015.

Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.
90% of the students will attain a score rating of 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the internship program (Spring 2009) received a 3.0 or higher on the clinical reasoning sub-scale.
M 10: CPS 7260 Acquire knowledge specific to application (O: 2, 5, 6, 7)
CPS Departmental Comprehensive Examination (1 of 12 subtest) measuring theory, strategies, application, and outcome for individual, family communication, and treatment.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O2: 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 rate.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 70% or higher on the application subtest.

**Target for O5: 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 rate.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 70% or higher on the application subtest.

**Target for O6: 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 rate.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 70% or higher on the application subtest.

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
90% of the students taking the comprehensive examination will pass this subtest of the comprehensive with a 70% pass rate.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of all students (71 out of 76) who completed the comprehensive examination scored a 70% or higher on the application subtest.

M 11: CPS 7260 Acquire knowledge specific to application (O: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9)
An external review is conducted across a national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample taking the National Counseling Examination. Human Relations is one of 8 measures. 90% of the students will average at or exceed the mean for the comparison groups. This submeasure has 43 questions out of a 200 item examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**
Students enrolled in the program will demonstrate a mean score that is equal to or exceeds 3 comparison groups (National Average, CACREP-only, non-CACREP). The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE exam during April.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
Students enrolled in the program will demonstrate a mean score that is equal to or exceeds 3 comparison groups (National Average, CACREP-only, non-CACREP). The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE exam during April.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**
Students enrolled in the program will demonstrate a mean score that is equal to or exceeds 3 comparison groups (National Average, CACREP-only, non-CACREP). The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE exam during April.

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**
Students enrolled in the program will demonstrate a mean score that is equal to or exceeds 3 comparison groups (National Average, CACREP-only, non-CACREP). The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE exam during April.

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**
Students enrolled in the program will demonstrate a mean score that is equal to or exceeds 3 comparison groups (National Average, CACREP-only, non-CACREP). The mean is set by the entire body taking the NCE exam during April.

M 12: National Counselors Examination (NCE) (O: 2, 8)
The NCE has 1 subtest of 8 devoted to ethics.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
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.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
92% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.
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.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
91% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

M 13: National Counselors Examination (O: 2, 4, 8, 9)
The 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.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
90% of the students will exceed 72% correct in the developmental subtest based on a national sample. 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 programs.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
92% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment
90% of the students will exceed 72% correct in the developmental subtest based on a national sample. 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 programs.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
92% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.
90% of the students will exceed 72% correct in the developmental subtest based on a national sample. 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 programs.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
92% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.
90% of the students will exceed 72% correct in the developmental subtest based on a national sample. 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 programs.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
91% of our students achieved 72% or higher on the end of year external review. 100% of our students did attain a mean score equal to or greater than the mean for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.

M 14: NCE: External Review for Theory (O: 2, 5, 6, 7, 9)
The subtest for human relations on the NCE measures knowledge and skill application in communications, theory, strategies, techniques, and ethics regarding individual and family counseling practice.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
Students enrolled our program will exceed the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest. The mean is set by the combined students taking the exam.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students enrolled on our Masters Program for Counseling who completed the National Counselors Examination exceeded the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest.

Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.
Students enrolled our program will exceed the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest. The mean is set by the combined students taking the exam.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Students enrolled on our Masters Program for Counseling who completed the National Counselors Examination exceeded the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Effectively works with groups of clients.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled our program will exceed the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest. The mean is set by the combined students taking the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled on our Masters Program for Counseling who completed the National Counselors Examination exceeded the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled our program will exceed the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest. The mean is set by the combined students taking the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled on our Masters Program for Counseling who completed the National Counselors Examination exceeded the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Counsel with other educational professionals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled our program will exceed the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest. The mean is set by the combined students taking the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled on our Masters Program for Counseling who completed the National Counselors Examination exceeded the mean of 3 external comparison groups (national, CACREP, and Non-CACREP) on the acquired and application skills subtest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: CPS Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9)**

The CPS Comprehensive Exam has 12 subsets assessing the overall knowledge in the core courses for the M.S. degree.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Practices educational, social, &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Effectively works with groups of clients.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.

**Target for O9: Counsel with other educational professionals.**

90% of the students will successfully pass the CPS comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94.7% of students successfully passed the CPS comprehensive exam. 76 took the comprehensive examination during the 2008-2009 academic year. 72 passed on the first attempt. Upon reexamination, all but one student passed.

**M 16: Form 1015: Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Form 1015 Scale 4: Assessment is evaluated for each student on a 1-5 Scale.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.**

95% of the students will attain a scaled rating of 3.0 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of all students enrolled in the internship during the academic year (2008-2009) scored 3.0 or higher on the Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (Form 1015)

**M 17: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 2, 3, 8)**

The CPS Departmental Examination has 1 subtest measuring research knowledge. The research subtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of our program students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of program students achieved a 72% or higher correct answers on the research subtest portion of the comprehensive examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of our program students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of program students achieved a 72% or higher correct answers on the research subtest portion of the comprehensive examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of our program students will achieve 72% or more correct on the research subtest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of program students achieved a 72% or higher correct answers on the research subtest portion of the comprehensive examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 18: Form 1015 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Form 1015 with 10 subscales (1-5 likert scale) 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 attitudes toward supervision.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Practices educational, social, &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015's overall knowledge subscale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O7: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015’s overall knowledge subscale.

Target for O8: Complete an entry level of training.

90% of the students will achieve an overall evaluation of 3.0 on a 1-5 rating scale on overall knowledge.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015’s overall knowledge subscale.

Target for O9: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of the students enrolled in the internship during the 2008-2009 academic year scored 3.0 or higher on the Form 1015’s overall knowledge subscale.

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

Assessment of development in practicum/internship experiences

The Professional Counseling Faculty (soon to be renamed the Clinical Mental Health Faculty) will schedule a meeting per semester in order to discuss student issues as they matriculate through the practicum and internship program. If faculty express concerns, the Coordinator of the program will meet with the student to discuss the aforementioned issues and ways to address faculty concerns.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Will implement this policy no later than the commencement of Spring semester 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Brian J. Dew, Coordinator of the Professional Counseling Program
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Given that we will be teaching the same number of students with fewer faculty resources, the department will enhance coordination between the various components of the masters program in Professional Counseling (group, helping skills, etc). A systematic review of student progress will occur at least 3 times per year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Due to the fact that our program met 100% of the goals, both in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years, no changes have been implemented. Furthermore, there were no specific objectives established in 2007-2008 that were to be addressed during 2008-2009.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our department has devoted significant attention to the development and retention of our Masters students in Professional Counseling. We have reduced the size of our program from approximately 90 students per year to 60 students per year and we continue to conduct interviews with applicants. As a result, our program has attracted higher caliber of applicants (as seen by average GRE and undergraduate GPA). We will continue to implement rigorous review of our students both prior to and during their practicum/internship.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

NONE. All goals and objectives were met. Therefore, no changes were determined to be necessary.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings of this year's assessment support our department's efforts in preparing masters level counselors to work in our community. We have always believed our program to be one of the nation's leading counselor education programs. The various data sources included in this report only support the optimal functioning of the department.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Our interviewing methods for prospective students will become more rigorous. As a result, the department expects to increase the quality of our students. As a result, scores on national exams as well as supervisory feedback should be elevated on average in this next year.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Nearly 100% of our M.S. students passed the 2009 National Counselor Examination. With the Summer/Fall admissions cohort starting in the 2009, our average undergraduate GPA's and GRE scores were the highest ever by an entering class.

Challenges for Next Year
Faculty are having to maintain consistent number of students in the program but are doing so with fewer faculty (as a result of unfilled teaching lines). Maintaining effective teaching in classrooms with more students, as well as less individual time with students inside/outside of class, will be an additional challenge.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None

Modifications in Measurement Methods
None

University-wide Committee Participation
Our faculty serve on a variety of university-related committees, including on GSU Faculty Senate as well as the IRB. Members of the faculty also serve on nearly 100% of the College committees, often serving in leadership positions.

Publications and Presentations
The Professional Counseling Faculty continues to be active in research and scholarly activities. Program faculty have published more than 18 peer-reviewed articles, over half involving students from our doctoral and masters program. Program faculty have also made more than 30 presentations during the 2008-2009 academic year at a range of national and regional conferences.

Academic Teaching Activities
Our Professional Counseling faculty continue to excel in the classroom, teaching a variety of masters-level and doctoral-level courses. Our faculty members also teach students from various programs including school counseling, rehabilitation counseling, and counseling psychology.

International Activities
Our program participated in an international exchange program by hosted college students from China in a variety of counseling courses.

Contributions to Student Retention
In the 2008-2009, Professional Counseling faculty met, when needed, to discuss issues related to student retention. The program held 3 retention hearings related to faculty concerns for a particular student.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Psychology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Contemporary Issues - Core (M: 1)
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Contemporary Issues Post-test questions (O: 1)**

Seventy percent of students correctly answer each of the six questions applying content to contemporary issues. The questions were:

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: the reciprocity norm. d. deindividuation. in-group bias. e. the mere exposure effect. the fundamental attribution error.

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. increasing; decreasing.

4. 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 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 confirmation bias.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Contemporary Issues - Core**

Our achievement target for this measure is 70% of students answering each question correctly.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

At least 70% of students answered all questions correctly except one. There were 6 questions. The percent of students answering each question correctly was: #2, 77%; #3, 92%; #14, 81%; #15, 83%; #20, 49% and #48, 70%.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Psychology BA, BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Theory and Content (M: 2)**

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

**SLO 2: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods (M: 1, 3, 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Application (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 1, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 3, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, &amp; society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>
</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>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes. A. Students demonstrate competent, ethical, and responsible use of information in academic work. B. Students apply software in research reports (e.g., statistical). C. Students master computer basics such as Internet navigation, document and spreadsheet generation. D. Students assess web-based sources of information, popular presentations of psychological research, as well as pseudoscience.</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>
<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>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology. A. Students understand the need to behave ethically in personal and professional domains, and appreciate the need to tolerate ambiguity. B. Students demonstrate skepticism and intellectual curiosity, atunement to scientific evidence, civic responsibility, and respect for human diversity.</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>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Contemporary Issues - Core (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Psyc 4760 Research Practicum Evaluation form (O: 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10)
This form is used by faculty and field supervisors to evaluate student performance in research practica using a 5-point scale from 1=poor and 5= excellent. We use this form to measure progress toward objectives: 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10. 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.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O2: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety percent of students received a rating of 4 or better regarding understanding of research design; eighty-three percent of students received a rating of 4 or better regarding understanding of statistics.

Target for O4: Communication and Collaboration Skills
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of students received a rating of 4 or better regarding written communication; ninety-eight percent of students received a rating of 4 or better regarding being a “team member.” The average ratings overall were 4.70 and 4.91.

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety-three percent of students were rated as 4 or better for being able to generalize research findings, with an average of 4.68.

Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All but one student received a rating of 5 of 5 for information and technology literacy with an average of 4.98.

Target for O8: Values in Psychology
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric for general research ethics and respect for diversity with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety-six percent of students were rated at 5 of 5 for research ethics by supervisors. One hundred percent were rated 5 of 5 for respect for diversity for an overall average of 4.94.

Target for O10: Career Planning and Development
Students should self-report a minimum of 3 on a 4 point scale, on average, for ratings of progress in professional development and career planning as a result of the research practicum.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
In fall, 2008, students self reported an average of 3.33 and 3.42 (out of 4, SD = .80 and .56) regarding career planning and professional development, respectively. In the spring of 2009, students self-reported an average of 3.31 and 3.37 for career planning and professional development, respectively.

M 2: Psyc 4770 Applied Practicum Evaluation Form (O: 1, 3, 9, 10)
This form is used by faculty and field supervisors to evaluate student performance in applied practica using a 5-point scale from 1=poor and 5= excellent. We use this form to measure progress toward objectives 1, 3, 9 and 10. 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.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O1: Theory and Content
Eighty percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Ninety percent of students were rated as 4 or better for understanding of basic theory, with an average of 4.54.

#### Target for O3: Application
Eighthly percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety-four percent of students were rated as 4 or better for utilizing concepts (application) with an average of 4.56.

#### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
Eighthly percent of students will receive a minimum evaluation of 4 on a 5 point rubric with an overall mean of 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Ninety-five percent of students were rated 4 or better for respect of diversity, with an average of 4.73.

#### Target for O10: Career Planning and Development
Eighthly percent of students will self-report a minimum evaluation of 3 on a 4 point scale regarding career planning and professional development.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Eighty-nine percent of students self rated as 3 or better (out of 4) for both career planning and professional development as a result of the applied practicum.

### M 3: Psychology 3010 Pretest-Postest (O: 2, 5)

10 computational and short-answer questions.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

#### Target for O2: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods
Seventy-five percent correct on post-test and significant improvement from pre-test. The pre- and post-tests include the same 10 computational and short answer questions.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
The average score on the post-test was 66.76% correct (SD = 2.07) compared with 28.15% correct on the pretest (SD = 1.15). This improvement was significant (t(91) = 15.38, p<0.001), with a large effect size (Cohen’s d = 1.6).

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
Seventy-five percent correct on post-test and significant improvement from pre-test. The pre- and post-tests include the same 10 computational and short answer questions.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
The average score on the post-test was 66.76% correct (SD = 2.07) compared with 28.15% correct on the pretest (SD = 1.15). This improvement was significant (t(91) = 15.38, p<0.001), with a large effect size (Cohen’s d = 1.6).

### M 4: Psychology 3110 self-report pre-post assessment (O: 4, 6)
The pre-and post-test self-report measure, “Gauge My Progress,” was drawn from the Core Communication (Miller & Miller, 1998) workbook used in the course. Consisting of questions pertaining to the 11 communication skills listed earlier, it asks the respondent to rate on a 5-point scale his or her typical and desired behaviors vis-à-vis the different skills. Improvement in communication skills is indicated by an increasingly smaller differential between ratings of typical and desired behaviors. The pre- and post-test measures were administered on the first and last days of class, respectively.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

#### Target for O4: Communication and Collaboration Skills
Significant improvement between pre- and post-testing; moderate or better effect size.

#### Target for O6: Personal Development
Significant improvement between pre- and post-testing; moderate or better effect size.

### M 5: Psychology 3110 listening and talking competencies (O: 4, 6)
Developed for purposes of this evaluation, the behavioral measure assessed students’ maximal performance in an interpersonal role-play situation in which they worked in groups of three rotating through the roles of listener, talker, and evaluator. The role-plays involved relational conflicts of an ethical nature. The students were evaluated on their ability to display each of the five listening and six talking skills at least once during the role-plays. The behavioral measure was administered during the last week of classes.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

#### Target for O4: Communication and Collaboration Skills
Demonstrate at least 80% of listening and talking skills (assessed separately).

#### Target for O6: Personal Development
**M 6: Discipline specific writing and critical analysis (O: 2, 4, 5)**

Pre- and post-tests (written assignments) are rated on two sets of criteria - one for overall writing quality and another for discipline-specific writing quality (adherence to APA style, e.g. appropriate reference citations, appropriate paraphrasing, etc.).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Research Methods: Understand & apply methods**

Significant improvement on both measures of writing quality (overall and APA style).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Students scored an average of 3.37 at posttest (compare to average of 2.63 pretest). This improvement was significant, $t(29) = 2.75$, $p<.01$.

**Target for O4: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

Significant improvement on both measures of writing quality (overall and APA style).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Students improved on overall grammar ratings (9.8 posttest compare to 9.37 pretest). This improvement was not significant, $t(29)=8.55$, $p=.399$.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

Significant improvement on both measures of writing quality (overall and APA style).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Students’ critical thinking improved between pretest ($M=3.03$, $SD=1.33$) and posttest ($M=3.53$, $SD=1.38$), however, this difference was not significant, $t(29)=1.74$, $p=.092$.

**M 7: Contemporary Issues Mastery Questions (O: 11)**

Selected questions from an introductory-level mastery test focusing on psychological theories and phenomena, with an emphasis on application of these concepts to contemporary situations.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O11: Contemporary Issues - Core**

Seventy percent of students correctly answer each of the six questions applying content to contemporary issues. The questions were:

1. 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: the reciprocity norm.d. deindividuation. in-group bias.e. the mere exposure effect. the fundamental attribution error. 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. increasing; decreasingc. increasing; increasing decreasing; decreasingd. increasing; decreasing; decreasing; increasing. 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: an inferiority complex.d. an internal locus of control. learned helplessness. e. reaction formation. repression. 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 surveyc. naturalistic observation a casestudyd. an experiment. 20. When shown photographs of facial expressions of basic emotions, people from 21 different countries: were able to accurately identify each of the emotions being expressed were only able to accurately identify the facial expressions from fear and disgust were able to accurately identify happiness, guilt, and disgust, but not anger and fear. varied greatly in their ability to correctly identify the different emotions being expressed.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 confirmation bias. framing. functional fixedness. the representativeness heuristic.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

At least 70% of students answered all questions correctly except one. There were 6 questions. The percent of students answering each question correctly was: #2, 77%; #3, 92%; #14, 81%; #15, 83%; #20, 49% and #48, 70%.

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

**Introduce CTW Courses**

Two new Critical Thinking through Writing courses come online this year: PSYC3530, Advanced Research Design and Analysis, part of our redesigned quantitative core, and PSYC4800, Seminar in Psychology. The former is a survey of advanced research designs and their appropriate statistical analyses. Students learn about advanced statistics and their application with an emphasis on expressing critical thinking about psychological research through writing. The latter is designed to be a senior year capstone course. We plan on offering several special topics seminars. This semester, we began offering a PSYC4800 seminar called Neurobiology of Music. As a CTW course, students are encouraged to demonstrate critical thinking about this topic in a variety of written assignments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** PSYC4800 is currently being offered (Fall, 2009). PSYC3530 will be offered in Spring 2010.
Remap measures to outcomes.

At the review of last year’s learning outcomes assessment, it was suggested we make some changes to our outcomes and the measures we use to assess them. Specifically, it was recommended that we have fewer objectives - at the time we were reporting on 11 learning objectives. It was also recommended we have fewer objectives being measured by a single outcome. To address these suggestions we have developed the following plan.

The 11 objectives we were monitoring were based on ten learning objectives recommended for undergraduate programs in psychology by the American Psychological Association in a 2000 report, plus our university core objective (Contemporary Issues). As the ten learning goals outlined by the APA are so well-suited for our undergraduate program, we feel strongly that we should monitor each goal. Our subcommittee has identified courses with measures already in place that we can use to track progress toward these goals. We could not find sufficient justification for eliminating any of the ten. We do not, however, see the necessity of reporting on our core objective along with our undergraduate program objectives, as we report on it separately.

While the goals themselves will remain very much the same, our mapping of measurements to goals will undergo a major revision. We anticipate it will take at least two years before we are measuring progress toward each goal with the new measures, but we have identified from which courses we will be collecting measurement data. For some of these courses we have already identified a specific measure, that is already being taken as part of the course, that we can use to track progress toward specific goals.

Our planned map of courses to goals is as follows: 1. Knowledge Base of Psychology - Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and historical trends in psychology. Course: PSYC1100. Measure: We already have a mastery test in place that we can use to measure progress toward this goal. 2. Research Methods in Psychology - Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation. Course: PSYC3510 (2’ measure PSYC3530) - we will need to find an existing measure in the course - this is the first semester it is being taught. 3. Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology - Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes. Course: PSYC4800 - We have a two sample writing analysis in the course already - we will use an existing CTW rubric to compare pre/post writing samples. 4. Application of Psychology - Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues. Course: PSYC2040, PSYC2101 - We need to identify an existing measure in these courses to serve as 1’ and 2’ measurements for this goal. 5. Values in Psychology - Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline. PSYC3510 - We need to identify an existing measure in these courses to serve as a measurement toward this goal. 6. Information and Technological Literacy - Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes. We have a measure in place that is perfect for this goal - the library works with our department to offer a quiz on the Psychology Online Research Tutorial. 7. Communication Skills - Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats. PSYC3110 - we will not change our existing measure for this goal. 8. Sociocultural and International Awareness - Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity. Course: PSYC3570 - Multicultural Psychology - We need to identify and existing measure in this course to serve as a measurement for this goal. 9. Personal Development - Students will develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement. Course: PSYC3110 - we will not change our existing measure for this goal. 10. Career Planning and Development - Students will emerge from the major with realistic ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills and values in occupational pursuits in a variety of settings. Course: PSYC2030 - Careers in Psychology - We will identify a measurement that already exists in this new course.

Update quantitative core.

The new Research Design and Analysis sequence is currently being offered (Fall, 2009) beginning with PSYC3510, the introductory course. The second course in the sequence, PSYC3530, will be offered beginning Spring 2010 (see CTW Action Plan).

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are in the process of implementing our revision of the quantitative core. The first course, Introductory Research Design and Analysis begins this semester (Fall, 2009) and the second, a CTW course, Advanced Research Design and Analysis begins in Spring 2009. One of our capstone CTW courses, Neurobiology of Music, is being taught this fall as well. A subcommittee of our Undergraduate Program Committee is charged with remapping our measurements of all learning objectives. We plan to implement these new measures over the next two years. (See Action Plan for more details).
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

One of the recommendations from last year's review of our Learning Outcomes Assessment was that we reduce the number of learning objectives and measure progress toward fewer objectives with single measures. We have developed a plan for addressing these recommendations that involves a major reorganization of our measurements (see Action Plans). We have completely revised our quantitative core to integrate Statistics and Research Methods in a two semester sequence of Introductory and Advanced Research Design and Analysis. We expect this revision to result in significant improvements in several learning outcomes, including Information and Technological Literacy, Critical Thinking Skills (see below), Research Methods in Psychology, Values in Psychology, and Communication Skills. We have introduced two Critical Thinking through Writing courses. Each course will have a mechanism for measuring progress toward one of our objectives, Critical Thinking Skills.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Overall, the findings are very encouraging. The Department of Psychology met target levels for 8 of 10 learning objectives this year. In particular, over 90% of students exceeded our target level for following objectives: Understand and Apply Research Methods, Theory and Content and Sociocultural and International Awareness. All but one student surveyed received the highest rating for Information and Technology Literacy. Target levels for the measurements of two objectives, Critical Thinking Skills and Communication Skills were partially met. We are carefully considering Critical Thinking Skills in the coming year as we introduce two Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) courses. We intend to take this opportunity to completely revise the way we measure progress toward all learning objectives, including Critical Thinking Skills.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Psychology PhD

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the PhD program in the Department of Psychology is to educate graduate students in various areas of psychology and provide specific training in scholarship, research, clinical, and other skills, consistent with the expertise of the current faculty. Five programs are represented: Clinical Psychology, Community Psychology, 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

SLO 1: Theory and Content (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16)
Develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in the field of Psychology, the program area, and the research specialty area.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Research Methods (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16)
Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)
Communicate and work in groups effectively.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Application (M: 1, 8, 12, 13, 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply psychological principles in professional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)</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: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 8, 12, 13, 16)</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: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 14, 15, 16)</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: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent and competitive academic programs</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 16)
Incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international issues in their work.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (M: 8, 12, 13, 16)
Emerge from graduate school with credentials and plans for career path.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: General Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8)
Doctoral examination scored by committee of faculty
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Theory and Content
90% passed on first attempt

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% passed on first attempt

Target for O2: Research Methods
90% passed on first attempt

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% passed on first attempt

Target for O4: Application
90% passed on first attempt

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% passed first time

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
90% passed on first attempt

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% passed

Target for O8: Values in Psychology
90% passed on first attempt

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% passed

M 2: MA proposal evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)
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)
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
### Target for O1: Theory and Content
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.4 |

### Target for O2: Research Methods
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.6 |

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.8 |

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.8 |

### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.6 |

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.4 |

### M 3: PhD proposal evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)
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)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

### Target for O1: Theory and Content
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.4 |

### Target for O2: Research Methods
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.6 |

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.6 |

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

| Findings 2008-2009 | Target: Met 
|--------------------|-------------
| Average rating = 2.7 |
Target for **O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.4

Target for **O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.3

**M 4: 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)
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.6

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.6

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.6

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.7

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.7

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.3

**M 5: 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)
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Average rating = 2.7

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.6

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.7

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.7

Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.6

Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.7

M 6: General Exam (Oral portion) (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)
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Theory and Content
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.4

Target for O2: Research Methods
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.1

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.4

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.2

Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Average rating = 2.7

Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
The average rating for each outcome should be 2 or higher.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Average rating = 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Performance in statistics courses (O: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8410 and Psyc 8420: Psychological Research Statistics I, and Psychological Research Statistics II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed expertise with data analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at least 93% of students met or exceeded expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 8: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Tenure-track faculty produced an average of 1.5 publications and 3.6 professional presentations co-authored by one or more students.

### M9: Performance in the history course (O: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9)

**Psyc 8500: History of Psychology - written assignment**

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

### 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectation

### Target for O2: Research Methods

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectation

### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectation

### Target for O8: Values in Psychology

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectation

### Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectation

### M10: 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
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded expectations

### M 11: Performance in ethics course (O: 8)
Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assessed knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
93% of students met or exceeded expectations

### M 12: Teaching performance (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)
Review of student-instruction course evaluations.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of GTAs met or exceeded expectations, based on student evaluations as reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies

**Target for O4: Application**
No more than 15% of GTAs with inadequate evaluations per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of GTAs met or exceeded expectations, based on student evaluations as reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of GTAs met or exceeded expectations, based on student evaluations as reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
91% of GTAs met or exceeded expectations, based on student evaluations as reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies

### M 13: Teaching training (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10)
Psyc 9900T: Teaching seminar
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or exceeded expectations

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or exceeded expectations

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or exceeded expectations

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or exceeded expectations

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% met or exceeded expectations

**M 14: PhD Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**M 15: Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)**
Evaluated by faculty committee and defended orally in committee meeting
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% passed on first attempt.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% passed on first attempt.

**M 16: 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.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
4% of students failed to meet expectations

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
1% of students failed to meet expectations

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

- **Target for O4: Application**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 0 students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 0 students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O6: Personal Development**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 1% of students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 0 students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 0 students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 0 students failed to meet expectations

- **Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
  - Fewer than 5% of annual student evaluations indicate problems in any of the outcomes.
  - **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
    - 1% of students failed to meet expectations

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year's Action Plan detailed 6 areas for improvement. Some of these were resolved and some are still under consideration. The Action Plan areas and resolution is as follows: 1) **Improve Data Analysis Skills** - The Graduate Program Committee and Chair have discussed whether a finer-grained analysis of student statistics learning is in order. It was determined that this level of detail is in order for a number of learning outcomes, and this larger issue is being discussed by the Graduate Program Committee. 2) **Improve Personal Development** - This Learning Outcome was reconsidered for a number of reasons, and is no longer being used. 3) **Improve Teaching Performance** - A faculty member is now in a dedicated position to evaluate student teaching, identify areas of weakness, and help in remediation of problem areas. This person along with the Director of Graduate Studies reviews teaching evaluations each semester in order to identify problems (e.g., low scores, student comments reflecting issues). In addition, this faculty member meets with all graduate instructors following mid-semester teaching evaluations to discuss instruction. 4) **Increase Diversity Training** - The Department is continuing to debate this issue. Currently 2 of the 5 programs require the Diversity course. The other 3 programs are debating whether to make this a requirement or not. The Department Diversity Committee continues to be active in the Department. 5) **Track Publications and Presentations** - Currently we track how many faculty have student co-authors, but do not track how many students author publications and presentations. The Graduate Program Committee is discussing including tracking of these data during student annual evaluations. 6) **Track Student Awards and Career Placement** - The Graduate Program Committee is discussing including tracking of student awards during student annual evaluations. Tracking career placement is more challenging.
and requires additional resources (e.g., frequent checking of addresses and new positions of graduates). The Graduate Program Committee will discuss how this might be achieved.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings for this year's assessment suggest that we are meeting or exceeding all Learning Outcomes targets. The Graduate Program Committee discussed these findings and considered that our assessment measures might not be sufficiently sensitive, that our targets might be increased in rigor, or that we are in fact achieving the training desired. Our plan is to work on fine-tuning our assessment measures and further discussing refining our learning outcome achievement targets.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Public Administration MPA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies prepares students to become leaders in public service careers as executives, managers, analysts, and policy specialists in government and nonprofit organizations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understanding disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public administration**

Students learn major disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public administration. This includes theories of organization and bureaucracy, administrative behavior and management, politics and administration, and public policy-making.

**G 2: Understanding of basic methods and statistics for applied research**

Students learn basic methods and statistics for research in the public and nonprofit sectors. These include the scientific method in applied research, elementary research design, measurement, qualitative research, computer-assisted data analysis, and beginning statistics including descriptive statistics, crosstabulation, introductory inferential statistics, and graphical presentations.

**G 3: Understanding advanced research methods and statistics**

Students understand advanced methods and statistics in applied research in the public and nonprofit sectors. These include survey research, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, sampling, and intermediate statistical techniques including analysis of variance, correlation and regression, and time-series analysis.

**G 4: Understanding basic principles of microeconomics applied to public administration**

Students will understand basic principles of microeconomics applied to public administration and policy.

**G 5: Understanding practice and problems of budgeting and finance in government**

Students understand the practice and problems of budgeting and finance in the public sector. This includes fiscal management in government with special emphasis on budgetary procedures and the means of budgetary analysis.

**G 6: Understanding approaches to management systems and strategies in nonprofit and public organizations**

Students understand the approaches to the management of systems and strategies in public and nonprofit organizations focusing primarily on problem-solving strategies and techniques for use at the executive and operating levels.

**G 7: Understanding legal issues relevant to public and nonprofit organizations**

Students understand basic legal issues relevant to the managers of public and nonprofit organizations.

**G 8: Understanding theories and practice of leadership and organizational behavior**

Students understand theories and practice of leadership and organizational behavior. This includes communication, motivation, group dynamics, organizational change, leadership and decision making in public organizations.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Describe historical development of public administration theory (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will describe the historical development of public administration theory in the US in its social and political context.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students demonstrate their understanding of key difference among the models of government and administrative reform which drive public policy in the US and elsewhere.

**SLO 3: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public service (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students must be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in the public service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Describe the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students describe the nature and function of the public service in the US, including the importance of public service in modern societies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (G: 2) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate master-level skills writing a policy-relevant research paper using real-world context. Students must be able to emphasize interpretation and application of statistics in reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (G: 4) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public sector decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy (G: 4) (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets (G: 5) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students be able to describe the political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets and budget making in the US.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 17: Describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (G: 5) (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students describe and explain the technical nature of public budgeting in the U.S., including the timetable and rules of the process that are typical of the three levels of government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (G: 5) (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to assess, explain, and compare the political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in the US.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 19: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6) (M: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks as they apply in the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design (G: 6) (M: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Students demonstrate the ability to understand the advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.

**SLO 21: Demonstrate understanding of key aspects of US legal system (G: 7) (M: 21)**

Students demonstrate an understanding of key aspects of the U.S. legal system's adjudicatory structures, sources of authority, legal procedures, and the Common Law approach.

**SLO 22: Demonstrate ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts (G: 7) (M: 22)**

Students able to demonstrate the ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts.

**SLO 23: Evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees (G: 7) (M: 23)**

Students able to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

**SLO 24: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (G: 7) (M: 24)**

Students demonstrate ability to understand administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution avenues to resolve conflict and grievances.

**SLO 25: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (G: 8) (M: 25)**

Students able to identify and evaluate the major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**SLO 26: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (G: 8) (M: 26)**

Students able to demonstrate how specific organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations.

**SLO 27: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (G: 8) (M: 27)**

Students demonstrate how to use organizational theories and related tools to solve practical management problems in a public and nonprofit agency.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Describe historical development of public administration thought in the US (O: 1)**

On the final examination students will demonstrate their ability to describe the historical development of public administration thought in the U.S. with a focus on its social and political context.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Describe historical development of public administration theory**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

86% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 2: Describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform (O: 2)**

In policy memos and on the final exam students will be able to describe and analyze the key difference between models of government and administrative reform driving public policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

87% at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 3: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public service (O: 3)**

In an ethics memo and on the final exam students will be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in public service.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public service**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- 87% at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 4: Describe the nature and function of the public sector (O: 4)**

On the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public sector.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Describe the nature and function of the public sector**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 5: Apply basic concepts of measures and using data sets (O: 5)**

Students complete problem sets in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- 99% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 6: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 6)**

Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 7: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 7)**

The students' third examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
- 96% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 8: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 8)**

The students first and second examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O10</strong></td>
<td>Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O12</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

- 92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
- 98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Target for O8: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five-point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Target for O9: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy**

Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Target for O10: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables**

Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Target for O11: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research**

Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Target for O12: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five-point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

98% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
M 13: Ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 13)

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm examination and final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O13: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

89% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 14: Demonstrated understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 14)

On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O14: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

85% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 15: Demonstrated ability to describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy (O: 15)

Students will demonstrate their ability to describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy on the final examination and course paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

85% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 16: Demonstrated ability to describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets (O: 16)

On Assignments 1 through 4, the midterm exam, final project, and final exam students will demonstrate the ability to describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: Describe political, legal, economic, social, and cultural factors influencing budgets

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 17: Demonstrated ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (O: 17)

Students demonstrate the ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting on assignments 1-4, the midterm and final examinations, and the final project.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: Describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of
the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

#### M 18: Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 18)

All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students’ ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O18: Compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

#### M 19: Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 19)

On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O19: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

#### M 20: Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 20)

Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O20: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

#### M 21: Demonstrated understanding of key aspects of US legal system (O: 21)

Students will complete three exercises that allow them to demonstrate their understanding of key aspects of US legal system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O21: Demonstrate understanding of key aspects of US legal system

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

#### M 22: Demonstrated ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts (O: 22)

The research proposal and research paper will allow the student to demonstrate the ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target for O22: Demonstrate ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 23: Evaluated the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees (O: 23)**

The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

**Target for O23: Evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 24: Demonstrated understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (O: 24)**

On the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.

**Target for O24: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 25: Demonstrated ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (O: 25)**

On a midterm and final examination students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**Target for O25: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 26: Demonstrated how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (O: 26)**

Students demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations on two examinations and a leadership application paper.

**Target for O26: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 27: Demonstrated how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (O: 27)**

On the midterm exam, the final exam, and the leadership application paper students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O27: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

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

**Faculty review of curriculum in progress**

In response to the WEAVE reporting process, the faculty who teach courses in the MPA program are engaged in an on-going process of curriculum review. During the past year several issues have been discussed and actions are pending. For example, the two-course sequence in research methods and statistics was a problem in the initial WEAVE report. Faculty met and examined the content of the two courses, variations in material covered by different instructors, and ways to make sections more consistent. This change was implemented during the past academic year, and progress made in better student learning outcomes. During the current academic year (2009-10), the issue has shifted to the discussion of two issues—the law course (PMAP 8411 Law for Public and Nonprofit Managers) and a potential capstone course. There is concern over the content and learning outcomes of the law course. It is under review, and new content related to contract law is under development for next year. There is also consideration of the issue of developing a capstone course for students in the MPA curriculum. A pilot version of the course was scheduled for the spring semester 2010, but not offered. The design and content of the course is under review for next year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MPA Committee and full faculty of the PMAP Department

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Public Health MPH**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Institute of Public Health has the mission of advancing health through leadership, scholarship, research, and service to better the human condition and promote the common good. The most significant application of that mission is to prepare students through the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree program to apply multi-disciplinary skills in public health practice and research and to assume leadership roles to address contemporary public health problems. The mission of the Institute of Public Health complements the stated mission of its administrative college home, the College of Health and Human Sciences, which is “to engage in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities that improve health and well-being and address social justice issues within a multi-cultural society.” With a focus on scholarship and research in urban health and health disparities, the Institute supports the mission of Georgia State University “to achieve a front-rank position among the nation’s premier state-supported universities located in an urban setting.” The Institute’s mission is strengthened by the objective of the University System of Georgia, through its Strategic Plan for Public Health Education, Research and Service, “to ensure that the System becomes one of the national leaders in public health education, research and service.”

Note: The Master of Public Health program began in the Fall of 2004 and currently has 120 graduate students enrolled. The first students graduated in Spring 2006.

**Goals**

**G 1: IPH Program Goal**

The goal of the GSU IPH is to uphold the overarching goal of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), which is to ‘enhance health in human populations through organized community effort’. The IPH focus is to prepare students to enter the public health workforce so that health problems of local communities, and the world, can be identified, addressed, and/or prevented.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Understand Core Public Health Concepts Articulate and utilize an understanding of core public health concepts in the areas of biostatistics, epidemiology, social and behavioral sciences, health services administration, and environmental health, as well as the eight emerging areas identified by IOM.
Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH]

### SLO 2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Demonstrate skills in public health research and communication.

### SLO 3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address these conditions.

### SLO 4: Assess Public Health Conditions (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Identify and assess the public health conditions, both assets and deficiencies, of populations.
Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH]

### SLO 5: Analyze Health Disparities (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Identify and analyze health disparities and design appropriate, culturally-competent prevention and intervention strategies.

### SLO 6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Understand and employ an 'ecological approach' to public health, with emphasis on linkages and relationships among the multiple determinants of health, to assure conditions that protect and promote the health of populations.

### 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: 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 (1. analytical assessment, 2. policy development/program planning, 3. communication, 4. cultural competency, 5. community dimension of practice, 6. basic public health sciences, 7. financial planning and management, 8. leadership and systems thinking)

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: 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 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 must present their thesis or capstone project in writing and defend it orally, to a faculty committee. Process evaluation will consider the number of thesis and capstone projects completed during each academic year.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone
### Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In total for this academic year, 27/27 (100%) of graduating students have successfully completed a thesis or special capstone project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: 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. Evaluation will be based on participation in survey, self-assessment of skill and application in the core competencies, and impact of graduate education experience on career and academic development.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

#### Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.

### Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.

### Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.

### Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.

### Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings

45% of alumni (based GSU university 43.2% alumni survey response benchmark) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Fifteen alumni (35.7% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Over two-thirds of alumni (66.7%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. No 2008-2009 alumni survey questions addressed current employment or publications/presentations.

### M 3: Successful Completion of Practicum (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

Each MPH student must complete a three (3) hour practicum or field experience prior to degree completion. Students are required to received 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 the term, and submit a portfolio or manuscript on their experience to be maintained in the Institute archive. Evaluation will measure the number of students who enroll in the practicum or field experience with data reflecting the number who receive an overall satisfactory course grade.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

### Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

### Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.
Target for **O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

Target for **O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

Target for **O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health**

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

Target for **O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

Target for **O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Forty-one students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 during the 2008-2009 academic year successfully passed the practicum course.

**M 4: 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 degree program objectives. A grade of "B" or better is required and successful completion of the core courses serves as evidence that foundational learning outcomes are being met. Evaluation will consider the number of students enrolled in each of the seven (7) core courses each academic year and the number of students receiving 'B' or better grades.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for **O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for **O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for **O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for **O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**

At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for **O5: Analyze Health Disparities**
At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health
At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings
At least 90% of MPH degree program students will earn at least a "B" grade in the core courses.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Less than one percent of all core course grades (3/369) awarded in AY 08-09 were less than a B.

M 5: Course Evaluations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
Students enrolled in IPH courses complete evaluations at the end of a term, 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. Sixty percent (60%) of all IPH courses will have an overall student evaluation of 4.0 or better.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.
Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings
Sixty percent (60%) of all courses taught within IPH will have a 4.0 overall course rating based on student evaluations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
For 08-09, 82% of IPH courses (40 out of 49) had overall student course evaluation ratings above 4.0.

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

Complete Doctoral Program Application
We are developing a proposal to initiate a PhD program within the IPH. We will continue to seek support and approval throughout the upcoming years.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing

Enhancing Alumni Communications
Due to the APR Self-Study, we were able to enhance our alumni response rate to the alumni survey this academic year. We want to maintain our exposure and contact with this very important stakeholder group as we move forward.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing

Revise Monitoring Measures
The IPH faculty and staff will collectively review and revise measures currently in place so that we can become more efficient in capturing our productivity, effectiveness, and quality.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We intend to revise the objectives that are tied to the measures set forth in the earliest version of WEAVE (AY 2005-2006). The measures included in our performance evaluation parallel the curriculum standards set forth by our accrediting organization—The Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH]. Therefore, these measures will stand. However, the objectives tied to each of these measures will be strengthened if they are embedded in the core courses.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
IPH faculty is discussing revisions to the achievement targets that currently guide the performance evaluation of student learning quality. We would like to make the evaluation criteria more closely aligned with core courses as a means to improve demonstrability that objectives are being met.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The findings for this year’s assessment has provided insight into opportunities for improvement both Institute wide, as well as specifically related to the curriculum. Faculty is using this information to revise syllabi and instruction/ course structure accordingly.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
The IPH has steadily been growing since its inception in 2004. Each year that passes, we have been able to fine-tune the operations in place. For example, in the earliest assessments, it has taken a few years to build an adequate alumni base to survey. Operationally, we are undergoing the Academic Program Review self-study exercise. This has helped us improve our methodology.
for administering the alumni survey and subsequently, our response rate has increased. We plan to integrate this change into our annual routine as well as improve the instrument that is used, so that we have stronger indicators of program impacts in relation to our graduates.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Overall, the faculty is pleased with the results of our 08-09 assessment. However, as previously stated, we are working together to ensure that our objectives are more closely aligned with core courses. This will help us in upcoming reaccreditation cycles and performance reporting.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will use consensus building to improve our systematic evaluation of learning quality. We anticipate that the slight changes that we need to make in the way we collect and review data will ultimately result in a great degree of improvement overall.

---
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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. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and values required to become responsible and visionary leaders in a wide range of settings. Students will understand development, implementation, and evaluation of policies in a variety 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understand citizenship, community and public service**

Citizenship is a basic component of a democratic society. Students learn the structure of the federal system as well and citizenship requirements for each level. The role of the individual as part of the larger community is also considered. Students become active participants in public service. This is a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) course.

**G 2: Understanding leadership in a variety of policy settings**

Students learn from leaders representing the range of policy settings—public, for-profit, and not-for-profit. Emphasis is upon leadership to produce change in organizations. Students also learn theoretical perspectives on leadership and organizational change. They compare practical views on leadership to theoretical perspectives.

**G 3: Understand the policy process and critical public policy issues**

Students describe the public policy process and understand critical policy issues.

**G 4: Understanding policy data analysis using statistical methods**

Students learn policy data analysis using quantitative research methods applicable to the study of public policy. Students use descriptive statistics as well as the development and testing of empirical hypotheses using basis inferential statistical methods.

**G 5: Understanding the evaluation of public policy**

Students learn to evaluate public policy using appropriate research methods for program evaluation. Inductive and deductive methods are used as well as the advantages of using evaluation as a mechanism for program improvement. This is a CTW course (Critical Thinking through Writing).

**G 6: Understand principles of policy analysis**

Students will understand principles of policy analysis including concepts such as market failure, public goods, and externalities, as well as other justifications for government involvement.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Describe the responsibilities of citizens (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate understanding of citizenship obligations within a local community by participating in local public decision making and describing the roles of citizens in shaping policy.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate the variety of ways in which citizens can help to shape public policy.

**SLO 3: Participate in public and community affairs (G: 1) (M: 2, 3)**

Through service learning students participate in public and community affairs. The students become active citizens of the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy (G: 1) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a CTW course, students develop writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students learn from leaders from all three sectors of society and how these leaders make changes within their organizational settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate their understanding of important issue in leadership theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Compare leadership theory and practice (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate their ability to compare theoretical aspects of leadership with practical applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Describe major steps in the public policy process (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate ability to describe the important steps in the public policy process and critical policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (G: 3) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation and examinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (G: 3) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Understand basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 4) (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy (G: 4) (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions in public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Understand scientific method applied to policy issues (G: 5) (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Define links among ethics, politics, and theory in policy evaluation (G: 5) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 17: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 5) (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW) (G: 5) (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 19: Understand variety of justifications for government involvement (G: 6) (M: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for government involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (G: 6) (M: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 21: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention (G: 6) (M: 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

| M 1: Describe Responsibilities of citizenship (O: 1) |
Students participate in a service learning assignment. They reflect on the service learning assignments, and students write weekly essays documenting their experience and classroom learning related to the responsibilities of citizenship. Students also take a midterm and final examination.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Describe the responsibilities of citizens**

85% or more of students will satisfactorily perform the task of writing an essay describing the obligations of citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 89% of the students at least partially demonstrated the skill or knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Students demonstrate how citizens shape public policy (O: 2, 3)**

Students demonstrate how citizens can help to shape public policy. This is demonstrated on the examinations as well as the writing assignments for the course.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy**

At least 85% of students will at least partially meet objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Participate in public and community affairs**

At least 85% of students will at least partially meet objective.

**M 3: Participate and report on public and community affairs through service learning (O: 3)**

Students participate in service learning and report on activities in their agencies that demonstrate how citizens work in public and community affairs. This is measured using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Participate in public and community affairs**

At least 85% of students will have at least partially met the objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Demonstrate writing skills appropriate to public policy (O: 4)**

Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy. This is demonstrated through weekly policy memos and a final paper that meet the CTW requirements of the course.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy**

At least 85% of students will at least partially meet the objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 86% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Students demonstrate how leaders from all sectors lead organizational change (O: 5)**

On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations**
At least 85% of students at least partially meet the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 6: Students answer test questions on midterm and final exams on leadership theory (O: 6)**

Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership**

At least 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their understanding on the examinations and paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 89% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 7: Students compare theoretical approaches to practical applications of leadership (O: 7)**

Students write paragraphs after each class period describing practical applications of leadership with theoretical perspectives. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O7: Compare leadership theory and practice**

At least 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their mastery of this learning objective on writing assignments.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 89% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 8: Demonstrate understanding of steps in policy process on exams & presentation (O: 8)**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of the major steps in the public policy process through examinations and a final class presentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Describe major steps in the public policy process**

At least 85% of students will at least partially meet the objective as measured on exams and the final presentation to the class.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 9: Demonstrate knowledge of main current policy issues (O: 9)**

Measure knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O9: demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate**

At least 85% of students will at least partially meet this objective as measured by policy debates in class and by examinations.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 88% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 10: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (O: 10)**
Apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation as well as the examinations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O10: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 89% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 11: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (O: 11)**

Students will exhibit critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O11: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 89% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 12: Demonstrate familiarity with basic concepts of statistical measures & data sets (O: 12)**

Students demonstrate their familiarity with the basic concepts concerning statistical measures and data sets. This is measured using examinations and class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O12: Understand basic concepts of measures and data sets**

At least 85% of students will partially meet the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 93% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 13: Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues (O: 13)**

Students apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze public policy issues. This is measured by performance on examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O13: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 14: Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 14)**

Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O14: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the skill.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: demonstrate understanding of scientific method applied to policy issues (O: 15)</th>
<th>Students demonstrate their understanding of scientific method as applied to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O15: Understand scientific method applied to policy issues</td>
<td>At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Define links among ethics, politics, and theory in evaluation research (O: 16)</th>
<th>Students must define the links among the ethics, politics, and theory in evaluation research. This is measured using midterm and final examinations as well as class assignments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O16: Define links among ethics, politics, and theory in policy evaluation</td>
<td>At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (O: 17)</th>
<th>Students demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research. These techniques include experiments, survey research, qualitative field research, and others. This will be measured using examinations and the major policy evaluation writing assignment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O17: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research</td>
<td>At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research proposal as a CTW assignment (O: 18)</th>
<th>Students will complete a written evaluation research proposal to demonstrate how they would design an evaluation project for a public policy. This is measured by the major CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O18: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW)</td>
<td>At least 85% of students will be able to partially demonstrate this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 87% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 19: demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for (O: 19) | Students demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for government involvement. This is measured through examinations and class assignments. |
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O19: Understand variety of justifications for government involvement**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 76% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 20: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (O: 20)**

Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O20: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy**

At least 85% of students will partially demonstrate the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 74% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 21: demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy (O: 21)**

Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O21: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention**

At least 85% of students will partially meet the objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 74% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

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

**Action Plan**

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores--secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

**Established In Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High
Basic Tools of Government Intervention
Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Objective/Objective):
- Measure: demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for
- Objective/Objective: Understand variety of justifications for government involvement

Basic Policy Analysis
Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Objective/Objective):
- Measure: demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for
- Objective/Objective: Understand variety of justifications for government involvement

Market Economy & Policy Analysis
Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Objective/Objective):
- Measure: demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for
- Objective/Objective: Understand variety of justifications for government involvement
It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy
Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory
Target Performance Level for Program: 75% of students will pass this section of the comprehensive exam.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
This past year, 6 of 7 students who took this section of the comprehensive exam passed. This is an 86% completion rate.

M 2: Analytical Methods Section of Comprehensive Exam (O: 2)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of analytical methods on the methods section of the core comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target for O2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy
75% of students will pass this section of the comprehensive exam.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
This past year 3 of 7 students failed the analytical methods section of the comprehensive examination. This is a 43% failure rate, and a 57% passing rate.

M 3: Major Field Comprehensive Examination (O: 3)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of a major field on the comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target for O3: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field
The achievement target rate for the major field comprehensive exam is for 90% of students to pass.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
This past academic year, all students passed the major field portion of the comprehensive exam. This is a 100% pass rate.

M 4: Dissertation and Original Research (O: 4)
Students will produce and defend a dissertation proposal, produce conference papers and journal manuscripts, and produce a doctoral dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target for O4: Produce Original Public Policy Research
Students will complete and successfully defend their dissertations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
This past year 7 students completed and defended their dissertations.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Revised methods courses and core comprehensive exam
In the 2007-08 WEAVE report this was among the stated objectives in the PhD Program in Public Policy: 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. After seeing that we did not meet this objective, the doctoral program committee met to review the content of the two required methods courses and the procedures used to measure the students' performance which is the percentage who pass the methods section of the comprehensive exam. The content of the two course sequence was revised by the committee and the staffing changed. As a result of this process, the student performance improved during the 2008-09 academic year, but this turnaround is a long-term process since students take the courses in their first year in the PhD program and the comprehensive exams are taken in year three. The doctoral program committee is continuing to monitor the progress of students in the two research methods classes and their performance as measured by the methods section of the comprehensive examination.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Program Committee of the Joint PhD Program in Public Policy

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Reading Specialist (p-12) MEd
As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The MEd program for reading specialists provides for master's level study of literacy processes and literacy instruction for culturally diverse learners with specialization in one of three options: reading instruction, early literacy, and teaching English as a Second
Language (ESOL). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, and demonstrate success in bringing students (P-12) from diverse background to high levels of learning. The program's underlying framework is social constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge by interacting with others and their environments. The MEd program for reading specialists encourages and supports planning, teaching and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban literacy education. Work in the program involves application of theory and practice in the Urban Literacy Clinic with students and families. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: G1: Knowledge and Expertise**

**G 1: Subject and pedagogical knowledge experts** Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are to become experts in literacy processes and development for students grades Pre-K through 12. Additionally, candidates are to gain the expertise in delivering high quality lessons for student success.

**G 2: G2: Commitment to urban education and students**

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

**G 3: G3: Critical Reflection**

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. Candidates will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: History of Reading (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Candidates are knowledgeable of reading research and histories of reading.

**O/O 2: Foundations of Reading and Writing (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

**O/O 3: SBRR (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.

**O/O 4: Creates a Literate Environment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**

Candidates integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

**O/O 5: Range of Curricular Materials (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)**

Candidates use a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

**O/O 6: Professional Development (G: 2, 3) (M: 6)**

Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

**O/O 7: Variety of Assessment Tools (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 7)**

Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

**O/O 8: Evaluate Practice (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 8)**

Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History (O: 1)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the history of reading research and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: History of Reading**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on the history of reading research through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 2)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Foundations of Reading and Writing**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR (O: 3)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: SBRR**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on SBRR principles through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments (O: 4)**

In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding how to integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: Creates a Literate Environment**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) on the standard of creating literate environments through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials (O: 5)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Range of Curricular Materials**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on the range of curricular materials for learners at different stages of the reading process and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev (O: 6)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: Professional Development**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on professional development through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment (O: 7)**
In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O7: Variety of Assessment Tools**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) on the standard of using a variety of assessment tools through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice (O: 8)**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other’s practice, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O8: Evaluate Practice**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on how to observe, evaluate and provide feedback to colleague’s work through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

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

**Redesigned Portfolio**

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Redesigned Portfolio**

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Association reading standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MEd faculty in Reading, Language and Literacy Education

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty involved in the MEd reading program are learning how to create iMovies. They are also familiarizing themselves with the 2010 International Reading Association reading standards for reading specialists. GRA support will be used to facilitate faculty members' development and learning of the technology so that by Fall 2010, the new portfolio will be in place.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Language and Literacy unit faculty have decided that the the portfolios have outlived their usefulness for students and for faculty. The students are spending an inordinate amount of time creating the documents; faculty are spending an inordinate amount of time reading the documents. To that end, a plan is in progress to utilize 21st century technologies and have students create video
documents that highlight and showcase their knowledge of the reading process, diagnosis and assessment, and instructional decision making. The students will learn how to make iMovies, which serves as a useful tool for their own classroom instruction.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In order for students to exit from the MEd program, they must receive at least a score of 4 (out of 5) on each standard in the portfolio. When students receive less than a 4 on a standard, they are asked to revise and resubmit until it satisfies the criteria for a 4. The results are not particularly useful because all students need to successfully pass the portfolio to exit the program. There is a large amount of faculty time used in reviewing and rating the portfolios. We are in the process of redesigning the portfolio to better demonstrate what students know and understand about the reading process, diagnosis and assessment, and instructional decision making.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online TEEMS MAT**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). Our online TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In this online program, we strive to realize a vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge experts**

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will become experts in reading, language, and literacy, and ESOL subject disciplines.

**G 2: Promote student language and literacy development**

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

**G 3: Become reflective practitioners**

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

**G 4: Become members of professional communities**

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

**Outcomes/Objectives**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: O1: Understands student development and learning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 9, 10, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 17, 18, 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 20, 21, 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 23, 24, 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: O8: Practices professional reflection (M: 26, 27, 28)</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 29, 30, 31)</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: O10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 32, 33, 34)</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>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: O1: Understands student development and learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Target: 75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: O1: Understands student development and learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via Live Text will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target for O1: Understands student development and learning

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 4: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 1)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Understands student development and learning

75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 5: M1: Portfolio (O: 2)

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 6: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing (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. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 7: M7: Portfolio rating standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt (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. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

### Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 8: M8: faculty ratings (O: 2)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 9: Portfolio (O: 3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Faculty ratings (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: M1: Portfolio (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: M1: Portfolio (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15: M 8: Faculty Ratings (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: M 8: Faculty Ratings (O: 4)</th>
<th>Faculty rating of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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 2008-2009** - Target: **Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: M 1: Portfolio (O: 5)</th>
<th>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: M 4: Portfolio Rating standard 4 Teaching (O: 5)</th>
<th>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Faculty Ratings (O: 5)</th>
<th>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning</strong></td>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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 2008-2009** - Target: **Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: M 1: Portfolio (O: 6)</th>
<th>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence:</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction</strong></td>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 21: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 6)

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 22: Faculty Ratings (O: 6)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 23: Portfolio (O: 7)

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 24: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 7)

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 25: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 7)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

### M 26: M1: Portfolio (O: 8)

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 27: M6: Portfolio rating standard 6 Advocacy and Colla (O: 8)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 28: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 8)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 29: M1: Portfolio (O: 9)**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 30: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture (O: 9)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 31: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 9)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 32: M1: Portfolio (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 33: M5: Portfolio Rating std 5 Professional Developmen (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 34: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

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

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M5: Portfolio Rating std 5 Professional Development | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M1: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Plan will be assessed in October 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Time for implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubri | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning

Implementation Description: Time to completely implement
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning
  Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
  Additional Resources: 0
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning
  Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
  Additional Resources: 0
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning
  Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
  Additional Resources: 0
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Faculty ratings | Outcome/Objective: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies
  Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
  Additional Resources: 0
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning
  Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
  Additional Resources: 0
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies  
**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio Support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning  
**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio Support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: M6: Portfolio rating standard 6 Advocacy and Collaboration | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection  
**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**  
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?  
The department chair will ensure that the program coordinator has time and resources to accomplish the action plan.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?  
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
N/A

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**  
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  
This year’s findings are incomplete. Faculty will continue to monitor assessment of student achievement.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online MEd
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The M.Ed. major in English Speakers of Other Languages provides for master's level study in ESOL Education and Reading Education and leads to T-5 certification in ESOL (grades K-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing K-12 students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in ESOL education. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals
G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge expert
Students in the online M.Ed program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and ESOL subject disciplines

G 2: promote student language and literacy development
Students in the online M.Ed.-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

G 3: Become reflective practitioners
Students in the online M.Ed. - ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become members of professional communities.
Students in the M.Ed. -ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: O1: Understands students development and learning (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
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: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (M: 5, 6, 7, 8)
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals

O/O 3: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (M: 9, 10, 11)
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

O/O 4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning (M: 12, 13, 14)
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 5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (M: 15, 16, 17)
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: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction (M: 18, 19, 20)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**O/O 7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 21, 22, 23)**
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 8: O8: Practices professional reflection (M: 24, 25, 26)**
This 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 9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (M: 27, 28, 29)**
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**O/O 10: O10: Involves school and community in learning (M: 30, 31, 32)**
This 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: Portfolio (O: 1)**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O1: O1: Understands students development and learning**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 2: M2: Portfolio rating Std 2 Reading and Writing (O: 1)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O1: O1: Understands students development and learning**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 3: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt (O: 1)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O1: O1: Understands students development and learning**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 4: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 1)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

**Target for O1: O1: Understands students development and learning**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 5: Portfolio (O: 2)

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 6: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing (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. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

**Target for O2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 7: M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt (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. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

**Target for O2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 8: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 2)

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

**Target for O2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 9: Portfolio (O: 3)

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O3: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

#### M 10: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 3)

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O3: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 11: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009</td>
<td>Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: M1: Portfolio (O: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: O4; Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009</td>
<td>Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: O4; Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009</td>
<td>Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14: M8: Faculty ratings (O: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: O4; Can motivate and manage students for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009</td>
<td>Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15: M1: Portfolio (O: 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: O5; Understands and uses assessment for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009</td>
<td>Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 16: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 17: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 5)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

**Target for O5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 18: Portfolio (O: 6)**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 19: M4; Portfolio rating standard 4 Teaching (O: 6)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 20: M8: faculty ratings (O: 6)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

**Target for O6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 21: M1: Portfolio (O: 7)**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. <strong>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. <strong>Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: M1: Portfolio (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric <strong>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: M6: Portfolio rating Standard 6 Advocacy and Colla (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. <strong>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 26: M8: Faculty Ratings (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. <strong>Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: O8: Practices professional reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 27: M1: Portfolio (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric <strong>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 28: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture (O: 9)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 29: M8; Faculty Ratings (O: 9)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure.

**Target for O9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 30: M1: Portfolio (O: 10)**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O10: O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 31: M5: Portfolio Rating Std 5 Professional Developmen (O: 10)**
A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O10: O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**M 32: M8; Faculty Ratings (O: 10)**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure.

**Target for O10: O10: Involves school and community in learning**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M5: Portfolio Rating Std 5 Professional Development | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

**Implementation Description:** Time for complementation
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** 0
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Embed standard**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Embed standard**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Embed standard**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | **Outcome/Objective:** O1: Understands students development and learning

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | **Outcome/Objective:** O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships ( Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6 Advocacy and Collaboration | **Outcome/Objective:** O8: Practices professional reflection

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** 0
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** M6: Portfolio rating Standard 6 Advocacy and Collaboration | **Outcome/Objective:** O8: Practices professional reflection

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources:** 0
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements.
It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M4; Portfolio rating standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: faculty ratings | Outcome/Objective: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M2: Portfolio rating Std 2 Reading and Writing | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards for portfolio
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards for portfolio
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
The department Chair will ensure that the program coordinator has adequate time and resources to accomplish the action plan.
**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This year's findings are incomplete. Faculty will continue to monitor assessment of students' achievement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (SBRR principles).

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language learning and teaching.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture (G: 1) (M: 3)**
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Culture subject discipline.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners (G: 3) (M: 5)**
Candidates will demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should reflect on, support and advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve their learning environment.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development (M: 4)**
Candidates will know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading and writing, and for accessing the core curriculum. Candidates will support ESOL students in accessing the core curriculum as they learn language and academic content together.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities (G: 4) (M: 6)**
Candidates are members of various learning and professional communities and organizations. Candidates will collaborate with and are prepared to serve as a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve learning for all ESOL students.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading (O: 1)**
Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading**
Our target is for all candidates to attain an intermediate level of knowledge in this standard.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the candidates attained an intermediate level of knowledge in this standard.

**M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 2)**
Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**
Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (level 3).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students successfully attained this standard.
**M 3: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture (O: 3)**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of our students met this target.

**M 4: Achievement of Instructional Practices (O: 4)**

Our target is for all candidates to attain an intermediate level of skills in this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development**

100% of the students successfully attained this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of our candidates met this target.

**M 5: Achievement of Reflective Action (O: 5)**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of performance in reflective advocacy through action (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners**

100% of our candidates successfully met this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of our students met this target.

**M 6: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership (O: 6)**

Our target is for all students to attain an intermediate pass or above in this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities**

100% of our students attained this target (n=3).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of our students attained this target (N=3).

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

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture  |  |  Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture
  - Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
  - Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
  - Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
  - Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
  - Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
- **Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Reflective Action | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Instructional Practices | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world, teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable, we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Analyzing the data, the median achievement level reached by our candidates is acceptable, but we are committed to setting a higher standard. We believe that our students deserve the highest quality of education, and we will strive to ensure that our candidates achieve this level of excellence.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: One year from this date we hope for the majority of our new cohort to attain this level of "highly qualified."

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL.
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
1. Discussions with all ESOL faculty who together can attain our targets;
2. Inform students of our goal to attain highly qualified status in all our standards;
3. And the use of promotional literature through internet and brochures to broadcast our plans to attain "highly qualified status;"
4. More focused and concentrated discussion and assignments on the role of advocacy and leadership in our students’ school programs for combating the prevailing deficit viewpoint on the part of fellow teachers in working with English language learners.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have re-ordered the courses to be taught to allow for greater uptake of key ESOL content. Given that our endorsement program is very intense, we have changed the Applied Linguistics course from the short summer session to the longer instructional period in the fall. This allows our candidates more time for uptake and recycling of information in the other related ESOL courses during the fall as the semester is longer.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that we are doing well generally but we would like to do better. Our scores in ESOL theory reflected some weaknesses with some of our students so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

NA

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Reading, Language, & Literacy (ESOL) TEEMS MAT
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

### Goals

**G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge expert**  
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become experts in Reading, Language Literacy and ESOL subject disciplines.

**G 2: Promote student language and literacy development**  
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

**G 3: Become reflective practitioners**  
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

**G 4: Become members of professional communities.**  
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Understands student development and learning (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**  
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Strategic Plan Associations**  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Strategic Plan Associations**  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 4: Can motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
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**  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual,
social, and physical development of the learner.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Can effectively plan for instruction (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Practices professional reflection (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)</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>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</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>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Understands student development and learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a satisfactory grade (score of 3 or higher) per domain based on the established rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of TEEMS-ESOL candidates (n=17) demonstrated proficiency at understanding the foundations of language acquisition and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Target for O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.
Target for **O5**: Understands and uses assessment for learning

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Target for **O6**: Can effectively plan for instruction

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Target for **O7**: Uses communication skills and technology

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Target for **O8**: Practices professional reflection

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of advocacy and collaboration through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Target for **O9**: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

88% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of cultural issues in the teaching and learning through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Target for **O10**: Involves school and community in learning

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (16 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of professional development through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1**: Understands student development and learning

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates demonstrated an "understanding of student development re: learning"
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates knew and used “multiple instructional strategies.”

**Target for O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates were able to “motivate and manage students for learning.”

**Target for O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates “understood and used assessment for learning.”

**Target for O6: Can effectively plan for instruction**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates were able to “effectively plan for instruction.”

**Target for O7: Uses communication skills and technology**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates used “communication skills and technology”

**Target for O8: Practices professional reflection**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students “practiced personal reflection.”

**Target for O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates were able to “effectively teach diverse groups of learners.”

**Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at “involving school and community in learning.”
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
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

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 assessment 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
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

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
(1) Discussions with all ESOL faculty who together can attain our targets; (2) Inform students of our goal to attain highly qualified status in all our standards; (3) And the use of promotional literature through internet and brochures to broadcast our plans to attain "highly qualified status." (4) More rigorous procedures for selection and admission of candidates to our program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have re-ordered the courses to be taught to allow for greater uptake of key ESOL content. Given that our program is very intense, we have changed the Applied Linguistics course from the short summer session to the longer instructional period in the fall. This allows our candidates more time for uptake and recycling of information in the other related ESOL courses.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that we are doing well generally but we would like to do better. Our scores in reading reflected some weaknesses with some of our students so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have these changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A
### Mission / Purpose
The BBA real estate major is designed for individuals entering careers in the real estate industry. It provides the student with the real estate knowledge and analytical skills necessary to support real property decisions in business environments as well as the requisite skills to effectively communicate them. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop 1) sufficient industry knowledge to support real estate decision making; 2) analytical skills leading to sound equity investment recommendations, value enhancing project funding strategies, effective project development plans; and 3) persuasive business communication skills.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: To develop creative decision-making skills (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 4 Critical Thinking |
| 6 Quantitative Skills |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: To develop business communication skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to communicate real estate decisions and recommendations effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 1 Written Communication |
| 2 Oral Communication |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Performance on writing assignments (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on writing assignments in writing intensive designated course Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
Average 78%. 78% of students achieved the target. The lowest report grades were students who did not meet with the Graduate Language Consultant because they thought they did not need assistance or did not read the directions. No plagiarism or students who didn't complete the reports during the semester, so we did better in those areas. More students completed the drafts on which we used a rubric for grading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Assignments in the real estate development course (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the real estate development course Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
Fall - average 86%. 94% of students achieved the target. Spring - average 84%. 86% of students achieved the target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Assignments in the finance and mortgage course (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the finance and mortgage banking course. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: Met
Fall - average 85%. 92% of students achieved the target. Spring - 82%. 80% of students achieved the target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Assignments in the real estate investment course (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on assignments in the real estate investment course Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**

75%

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fall - average 82%. 85% of students achieved the target.
Spring - average 84%. 82% of students achieved the target.

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

**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
- Implementation Description: 8/15/07
- Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair
- Additional Resources: None

**CTW assessment development plan**

Develop RE4700 as a CTW course and plan to implement assessment of students in 2010-2011.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Paul Gallimore

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Real Estate MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Science in Real Estate degree is designed for individuals who are principally interested in careers in the real estate industry and those who will use real property in business decision making. It provides the student with both general and specialized real estate knowledge and analytical skills. The MSRE program is based on a synthesis of legal, physical, market and financial considerations that affect the real property decision process. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop and integrate: (1) analytical skills for decision making associated with the real estate industry (2) leadership skills, and (3) interpersonal skills that contribute to teamwork.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand the real estate framework (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 1. Understand the framework within which real estate markets operate and the interaction of the components of that framework

**SLO 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills (M: 4, 5, 6)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 2 Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems

**SLO 3: Organize and communicate effectively (M: 7, 8)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 3. Organize and communicate effectively in all stages of the real estate problem solving process

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Real estate as a financial and operational asset (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 M1 Understand real estate as a financial and operational asset and its market Criteria (and course location of assessment): Appreciate the nature and working of real estate markets and the motivations of various participants (investor, developer, finance-provider, occupant etc.). (RE8020) Understand the role of finance in real estate markets (RE8030) Recognize impact of regulatory and institutional frameworks upon markets and assets within markets and the role of real property law as a risk management process in the acquisition, management and disposition of built space (RE8040) Understand the processes and techniques used to analyze supply and demand for real estate (RE8060).

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework**
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Phased implementation in this session so assessment framework confined to RE8020 and RE8030. RE8020 - average 2.44. 78% of students achieved 2.0 or higher. RE8030 - average 2.2.

**M 2: The markets for capital (O: 1)**

M2 Understand the markets for capital and related financial assets Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the nature and working of markets for financial capital (RE 8030) Understand the dynamic inter-relationships between capital markets and real estate markets (RE8020)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework**

2.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

RE8020 - 2.11 average. 78% of students achieved target or higher. RE8030 - 2.7 average.

**M 3: The real estate system and the production cycle (O: 1)**

M3 Understand the real estate system and the production cycle Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the key theories that describe and explain the functioning and evolution of real estate markets (RE8020) Understand the economic forces that affect demand, supply, equilibrium and disequilibrium in real estate markets (RE8020) Comprehend the contributions of different components in the real estate development process, and the design and production dimensions of real estate development (RE8050)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework**

2.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Phased implementation in this session so assessment framework confined to RE8020. RE8020 - average 2.44 and all students achieved the target on both criteria.

**M 4: Application to real estate investment problems (O: 2)**

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Phased implementation in this session so assessment framework confined to RE8020. RE8020 - 2.44 with 89% of students achieving the target.

**M 5: Application to real estate financing problems (O: 2)**

M2 Select and apply appropriate techniques to the analysis and solution of real estate financing problems Criteria (and course location of assessment): Identify, evaluate and assemble key data for use in analysis of real estate finance decisions (RE8030) Select and apply appropriate instruments and techniques to support real estate finance decision-making (RE8030) Critically review techniques and data issues in real estate finance (RE8030)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

3.0 average.

**M 6: Application to real estate development problems (O: 2)**

M3 Select and apply appropriate techniques to the analysis and solution of real estate development problems Criteria (and course location of assessment): Identify, evaluate and assemble key data for use in analysis of real estate development decisions (RE8080) Select and apply appropriate techniques to support real estate development decision-making at project planning and project implementation stages (RE8080) Critically review techniques and data issues in real estate project planning and real estate development (RE8080)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Average 2.72 and 100% students achieved target against all three criteria.

**M 7: Skills in investigation design and organization (O: 3)**
M1 Demonstrate effective skills in the design and organization of investigations to support the solution of real estate problems
Criteria (and course location of assessment): Identify appropriate investigations in response to real estate decision problems (RE8070) Produce coherent and articulated analyses targeted at a range of quantitative and qualitative real estate problems (RE8070)
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Organize and communicate effectively

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Phased implementation in this session so assessment framework unable to be applied in respect of this measure.

M2 Demonstrate effective skills in the presentation of findings Criteria (and course location of assessment): Develop arguments to support analysis and recommendation relating to real estate decisions (RE8090) Assemble and deliver arguments and recommendations so as to achieve desired outcomes (RE8090)
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Organize and communicate effectively

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
2.0
2.4 average.

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

Mission / Purpose
The Department of 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. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final

Goals
G 1: Successfully obtain employment
Students, upon graduation, will obtain employment or continue their education in areas of their professional interests.

G 2: Certification and/or licensing
Students, upon graduation and within the time frames as established by regulation or protocol, will successfully achieve relevant licensing and/or certification(s) if applicable.

G 3: Work with clients with disabilities
Students, upon graduation, if applicable, will be employed in settings which benefit people with cognitive, emotional and/or physical disabilities. Note: Other acceptable options are that some graduates may (1) select to continue their education, (2) delay entry into the workforce to raise a family, or (3) work in settings which may indirectly benefit people with disabilities (e.g., employment with policy or regulatory setting agencies, educational institutions, etc.).

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate competence in applying the foundations of rehabilitation counseling to their field work, including knowledge of its history, professional identify, 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 (G: 2) (M: 1, 2) |
| Practice ethical codes consistent with Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) requirements and state licensing. |
| Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Work with clients with disabilities (G: 3) (M: 2, 3, 4) |
| 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
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**O/O 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)**

Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, et al.

**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
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

| O/O 5: Successfully secure employment (or continue educ) (G: 1) |
| 80 per cent of students will successfully located relevant employment within six month of graduation. Others may choose to continue their education. |
| Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

3 Contribute to the greater community good
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: Certification tests and major exams (O: 1, 2) |
| a) National certification exam by students/graduates, and b) passing master's comprehensive exams |
| Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam |

**Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence**

(a) At least 90% pass rate on the national CRC exam by graduates/students and (b) 85% pass rate for students attempting the end-of-program comprehensives.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
From the most recent report by the Certification Commission, 100% of students passed the CRC exam. Only one student failed the masters comprehensive and she passed on the second attempt.

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**

Students who elect to take the CRC exam will surpass the national average. Most students will pass the masters comprehensive exam on the first try.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

From the most recent report by the Certification Commission, 100% of students passed the CRC exam. Only one student failed the masters comprehensive and she passed on the second attempt.

**M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Reviews during classes CPS 6050, 6450, 7430, 7660, 7680 as assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation, forms 1005, 1006, comprehensives and CRC.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence**

Assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students were assessed and one student did not meet expected performance goals and was dropped from the program through due process.

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**

Performance was assessed through exams associated with several classes (e.g., 6050, 7260, 7430 and others) as well as practical application in classes such as practicum/internship, skills development and group counseling.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students were assessed and one student did not meet expected performance goals and was dropped from the program through due process.

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**

Students in internships will achieve acceptable performance as assessed by (1) faculty and (2) site supervisors utilizing a written format as well as comment on tape recorded sessions. Students in the assessment course will achieve passing scores on class projects

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All but one student achieved the desired level of performance. The one student revised his project report to an acceptable score.

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**

Students in internships will achieve acceptable performance as assessed by (1) faculty and (2) site supervisors utilizing a written format as well as comment on tape recorded sessions with accent on counseling and/or consulting with clients from a variety of ethnic origins and culture as well as with various disabilities.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students met the expected levels of performance. Site supervisors reports were much higher than targeted.

**M 3: Evaluation of work with clients with disabilities (O: 1, 3, 4)**

Demonstration will be examined by (a) At least 90% of students will successfully complete an assessment of rehabilitation potential of a “real” client, and they will have adequate grades for term papers on topics of disabilities in CPS 8410 and 8420. They will also achieve satisfactory written review of performance with clients in their practicum/internship sites by the faculty instructor and on-site supervisors. (b) Written evaluation and group evaluation experiential interaction in self-disclosure and core conditions, as well as CPS 7660 (form 1005) and 6410, (c) CPS 7430 assessment project, and (e) 80% of internship supervisors will rate students as good or better.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence**

Written evaluation and group evaluation experiential interaction in self-disclosure and core conditions, as well as CPS 7660 (form 1005) and 6410, CPS 7430 assessment project, and 80% of internship supervisors will rate students as good or better. Continued accreditation by the Council on Rehabilitation Education.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students met the goals based on faculty assessments and reports from site supervisors. The program continues to enjoy full accreditation by the CORE.

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**

90% of the students will demonstrate appropriate assessment of rehabilitation potential through personality testing and evaluation of medical records, etc.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students met the goals based on faculty assessments and reports from site supervisors. The program continues to enjoy full accreditation by the CORE.
Based on the assessment project with a "real client" all but one student achieved the desired level of performance. The one student whose work needed improvement revised his project and met expected goals. Internship supervisors (faculty and site) reported that all students achieved the appropriate level of performance.

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
Partial fulfillment of this outcome will be related to successfully finding employment in a relevant occupation, or continue their education.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All but one student technically met the goal. One student has chosen to have and raise a child before pursuing employment. For purposes of this report, the student did not fail to meet the goal, but made a personal choice.

**M 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (O: 3, 4)**
Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse populations including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, etc.

**Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**
Students will achieve satisfactory written review of performance with clients in their practicum/internship sites by the faculty instructor and on-site supervisors. Also, CPS 7660 (form 1005) and 6410, CPS 7430 assessment project, and 80% of internship supervisors will rate students as good or better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students met performance goals. Questionnaires sent to on-site supervisors with rankings of 1 to 5 with 3 = good, the average rating was more than 4.0 in all but one of 12 categories. Only one student on one category was rated as average. All other responses were good or higher (lowest total score for a category was 3.87).

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**
Students will achieve passing grades as well as achieve performance expectations as assessed through the client assessment project, competence in counseling theories acquisition, papers developed for the medical aspects classes (8410 and 8420), and demonstrated competence as assessed by faculty and site supervisors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All students but one met the goals associated with this topic. One student was not able to achieve acceptable levels of performance and did not demonstrate appropriate corrective action when an intervention was initiated and was dropped from the program (same student as reported earlier).

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

**Continued accreditation**
The program will meet accreditation requirements and an outside board of advisors will be included in the rehabilitation program planning.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Certification tests and major exams | Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice

  **Implementation Description:** Continued accreditation by CORE and participation by board of advisors.

  **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2009

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed

**Ethics class/DSM Training**
The program evaluation from the past year has detected that the ethics training in infused in several classes and several areas of overlap exist. We have also noted that diagnostic training (DSM) could be enhanced. This issue was discussed with the rehabilitation advisory board and over the next year there are plans to enhance ethics training in the introductory class (6050), eliminate the "stand alone" ethics class and require the DSM training class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Certification tests and major exams | Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice
  - Measure: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct | Outcome/Objective: Certification and licensing ethical code practice

  **Implementation Description:** Intiate the application to academic affairs.

  **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Roger Weed, Lindy Parker, Debbie Berens

**Reviews of student competence**
The coordinator of the program will solicit information from faculty of classes designed for demonstration of competence and site supervisors for internships.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
Reviews of student competence with clients
The assessment project and internship evaluations will be reviewed for adequacy of practical application of educational outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: “Real” clients for assessment project and internship sites.
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed and Joe Hill

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Change from a standalone ethics class to a class in DSM training and a revision of the introductory class to include more ethics content.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
There have been no material changes over the last year. As previously reported, the accreditation review of the program during the spring 2008 the findings were no program deficiencies, weaknesses or recommendations. However, based on student comments regarding the overlap of ethics and the need to additional training in diagnostics, a stand alone class on ethics will be discontinued in favor of adding training for the Diagnostic and Statistics Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). Additionally, there were changes in the rehabilitation program website to assure compliance with accessibility standards and make clear the route for making comments, or identifying problems.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Generally, the rehabilitation program is functioning very well. As mentioned above, there is one academic programming change currently being proposed.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Contact with relevant parties was carried out and no material changes are required.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
As mentioned above, based on student comments, etc., one programming change is under way (discontinue a stand alone ethics class, enhance the ethics content in the introductory class and require DSM training).

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The strategies for improvement are the same as the previous year. Namely, ongoing review of program for compliance with Council for Rehabilitation Education (CORE) requirements, solicitation of comments from relevant faculty, consultation with the advisory board, annual evaluation with the department chair, solicitation of comments from internship site supervisors, (based on CORE requirements questionnaire), solicitation of comments from recent graduates (questionnaire), and student evaluation comments.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
1. Most importantly, accreditation reviews of the program were excellent. 2. Grant proposal for renewal of the Rehabilitation Services Administration scholars program was submitted ($750,000 over 5 years). At the time of this report, we are awaiting word.

Challenges for Next Year
Challenges include reduced funding for all university programs which also affects rehabilitation education. Support services have been deteriorating or lost. Succession planning for the coordinator has been deferred. There is more than enough work for another tenure track rehabilitation educator. However, part-time instructors, higher class counts, or “overloads” to other faculty has been the response.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None over the past academic year. For the upcoming academic year, transition to DSM training by fall semester 2010.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
University-wide Committee Participation
Member – Pre-Retention Committee (three student reviews Fall 2006, Spring 2007(one rehabilitation student, fall 2009). Executive Committee, Counseling and Psychological Services Department, 2000 - present Promotion and tenure committee, Counseling and Psychological Services Department. 1999 – present (Chair, 2004 to present) Coordinator, graduate rehabilitation counselor training program. Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University, 1987 - present Member, Research pre-lim committee, Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University, 1987 - present Member, Counselor Education and Practice Ph.D. admissions committee, Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University 1987 - present Member, Counseling Psychology Ph.D. admissions committee, Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University 1987 - present Ph.D. admissions committee, Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University 1987 - present Dissertation Committees/Doctoral Committees Participant regarding advocacy in counseling – Student Research Expo, CPS department, April 3, 2009

Publications and Presentations

Academic Teaching Activities
Coordinator information only CPS 8410 CPS 7260 CPS 8420 CPS 7430 Directed readings (summer, 2009)

International Activities

Contributions to Student Retention
The primary effort has been directed toward recruitment to build the program. Efforts included added information sessions, cross program faculty support (e.g., interviews with prospective students who appears to have interests in line with rehabilitation education were referred to the coordinator). Last year the ceiling of 25 students was reached. This year, applications exceeded 50. Students who seemed to be struggling were contacted and plans were implemented to improve performance (for example, one student re-submitted a project which was below expectations). In spite of the interventions, one student did not comply with departmental expectations and is no longer in the rehabilitation program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Religious Studies BA

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

Goals

G 1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate knowledge in the following areas: 1) Religious Traditions of the World (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) 2) Foundational Thinkers in the World Religions (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) 3) Major Religious Thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Elaidie, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, Z Smith, etc.) 5) Representative Critical Theories and Methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological ethical, feminist, etc.) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Common Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.) 8) Historical Role in Religion in Culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, sycretism, art and music, etc.)

G 2: Technical Skills in the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate technical skills in the following areas: 1) Reading Critically (outlining arguments, identifying conclusions, contextualizing author and text, detecting vagueness/ambiguity, etc.) 2) Thinking and Writing Critically (establishing premises and reaching conclusion, avoiding fallacies, utilizing proper
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Knowledge of General Religious History (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)**
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.

**SLO 3: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)**
Ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 8: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Ability to think critically and write persuasively within the academic study of religion.

**O/O 9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Theoretical)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 2.7 or higher. 83% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 2.7 or higher. 83% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 2.7 or higher. 83% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 3.3 or higher.

**M 3: Evaluation of Capstone Papers (Technical Skills) (O: 8, 9)**
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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O8: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression**
75% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 2.7 or higher. 96% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
75% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 2.7 or higher. 96% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 3.3 or higher.

### M 4: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Numerical) (O: 1, 3, 8, 9)

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.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of student rankings were 4.00 or higher. Mean student ranking was 4.63

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of rankings scored 4.0 or higher. Mean ranking scored 4.63

**Target for O8: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of student rankings scored 4.00 or higher; mean ranking scored 4.82

**Target for O9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
88% of student rankings scored 4.00 or higher; mean ranking scored 4.38

### M 5: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Narrative) (O: 1, 3, 8, 9)

Graduating Majors are solicited to identify particular strengths of the program and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular area.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Strong positive consensus. No significant dissatisfaction.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular area.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Strong positive consensus. No significant dissatisfaction.
Target for O8: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular area.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Strong positive consensus. No significant dissatisfaction.

Target for O9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion

Strong consensus on the success of the program in all areas related to articulated learning goals. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular area.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Strong positive consensus. No significant dissatisfaction.

M 6: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Narrative) (O: 1, 3, 8, 9)

Graduating Majors are solicited to identify particular strengths of the program and to offer detailed suggestions for improvements to the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

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

Long-Range Curricular Planning

With the addition of several new faculty over the last two years, and more likely forthcoming, the Department will develop a comprehensive, but flexible plan for curricular offerings over the next several years.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond, Jonathan Herman, Curriculum Committee

Modifying Assessment Criteria

The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Herman, Assessment Committee

Research and CTW Courses

The Department will take deliberate steps to provide a significant research component in at least one of the required CTW courses.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Tim Renick

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are engaged in long-range curricular planning, including discussion of configuration of CTW classes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department will develop a plan to integrate a research component into at least one of the required CTW courses. We will have ongoing conversations about how to expose students to various research methods.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This is the first time that the Department has fallen short of the target in this particular area, and even here it was only slightly below target. Nevertheless, we have been aware that students over the years have not performed as strongly in research as in other areas, and this provides impetus to continue our conversations on this topic.
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 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.

Goals

G 1: Fluency in the Academic Study of Religion

It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies achieve fluency in the academic study of religion, so that they may go on to doctoral work in the field, teach religious studies in a community college or high school, or bring what they learned here to bear on whatever field they pursue. This entails basic knowledge of the religious traditions of the world (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam), fundamental historical religious figures (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) major religious thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.), major theorists in the study of religion (Eliaide, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) representative critical theories and methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological ethical, feminist, etc.), fundamental technical categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.), common comparative themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.), and the historical role of religion in culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, sycretism, art and music, etc.).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of History of Religions (M: 1, 5)

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.

SLO 2: Knowledge of Theories of Religion (M: 2, 5)

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.

SLO 3: Methodological Approaches to Religion (M: 4, 5)

Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.

SLO 4: Comparative Approaches to Religion (M: 4, 5)

Ability to compare two or more traditions with regard to at least one specific theme.

SLO 5: Reading Scholarly Texts (M: 3, 5)

The ability to read scholarly texts critically and with comprehension.

SLO 6: Research in Religious Studies (M: 1, 5)

The ability to conduct effective scholarly research in religious studies.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 7: Critical Thought and Expression (M: 3, 5)

The ability to construct clearly written arguments and commentary.
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Historical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 1, 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 numerical grade (4.0 scale) on mastery of historical content. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of this content.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O1: Knowledge of History of Religions
75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of faculty evaluations ranked 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the relevant learning outcomes.

#### Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies
75% of faculty evaluations of historical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of evaluations scored 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

### M 2: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses (O: 2)
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 numerical grade (4.0 scale) on mastery of theoretical content. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O2: Knowledge of Theories of Religion
75% of faculty evaluations of theoretical content scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
70% of evaluations scored 3.3 or higher. Some evaluations indicated concern for particular students' abilities to distinguish among theories, to draw connections between theory and data, and to converse fluently in relevant terminology.

### M 3: Critical Reading/Writing Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 5, 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 reading, thinking, and writing in the academic study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student’s command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts
75% of faculty evaluations on critical skills scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
80% of evaluations scored 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

#### Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression
75% of faculty evaluations scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
80% of evaluations scored 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

### M 4: Methodological Evaluation of M.A. Thesis (O: 3, 4)
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 numerical grade (4.0 scale) on the ability to apply different methodological approaches to the study of religion. Moreover, each faculty member makes specific written comments evaluating the student's command of these skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
75% of faculty evaluations on methodological issues scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
56% of evaluations scored 3.3 or higher. Comments indicate that all students were adept at their chosen methodologies, but that some had some trouble considering other methodological approaches.

Target for O4: Comparative Approaches to Religion
75% of faculty evaluations on methodological issues scoring 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the stipulated learning outcomes.

M 5: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Each graduating MA student is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies masters degree 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. Moreover, students were asked to offer comments specifically addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the program, advise for future graduate students, and so forth.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O1: Knowledge of History of Religions
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Theories of Religion
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O3: Methodological Approaches to Religion
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O4: Comparative Approaches to Religion
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O5: Reading Scholarly Texts
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O6: Research in Religious Studies
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scoring 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaling 4.50 or higher. No significant evidence of student dissatisfaction with particular issue.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All student responses to all questions were 5.0. No students indicated significant dissatisfaction with any aspect of the program.

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

Monitoring Thesis Research
The Graduate Committee will implement changes in the process by which students conceptualize and research their theses, mandating more familiarity with research techniques, library resources, and alternative methodologies.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

New Assessment Criteria
The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 03/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Herman, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

Scheduling Graduate Seminars
The Department will develop a long-range plan for developing and staffing a diverse range of appropriately configured graduate-only seminars.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 02/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond, Vincent Lloyd, Curriculum Committee

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We plan to make concrete changes in the Assessment procedure, the process by which students get their thesis prospectus approved, and the scheduling of graduate-level seminars.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Because the M.A. was established only in 2005, we are still assembling a critical mass of data to produce action plans. The most significant changes are the addition of a required course in Theory and Method in the Study of Religion, and modifications to the Thesis Prospectus project.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
It is significant in that it identifies particular areas in methodology and research methods where students would benefit from more specific attention. We are now discussing the addition of research-based seminars, modifications to the thesis research process, and so on.
### Mission / Purpose

The purpose of the Bachelor of Science Program in Respiratory Therapy is to prepare respiratory therapists and future leaders in the profession of respiratory care who are qualified to deliver respiratory care therapeutic modalities to patients who have breathing or other cardiopulmonary disorders. The theme of this program is to develop respiratory therapists as consultants who can recommend changes as needed to patients and families about lung disease so they can maximize their recovery. Coursework, extensive clinical practice experience and collaborations among healthcare professionals combine to develop a program that supports the professional growth of novice respiratory therapists.

### Goals

**G 1: Respiratory Therapy**

Our goals for student learning include: 1. students become critical and ethical thinkers 2. students are knowledgeable about the professional issues of respiratory care 3. students are prepared for leadership positions in healthcare settings where respiratory care is practiced

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Communication (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to: 1. communicate orally by presenting a patient case study to the faculty and their peers which is logically organized based and on data found in medical records and/or oral interviews 2. communicate in writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline through problem solving by addressing patient care plans

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Advancing respiratory therapy skills (M: 3, 4)**

Students will be able to demonstrate respiratory therapy skills at a advanced level at the mid-point of the program and in the last semester.

**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
- 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: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy (M: 5, 6)**

Students are 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
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Case Presentation (O: 1)**

All students must successfully orally present a case study to the faculty and students at least once during the clinical seminar as part of their clinical practice rotations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case presentation scores will average 90% based on a standard rubric used by the faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Thirteen senior students presented in fall 2008. Scores ranged from 79% to 97%. Eight students scored below the 90% achievement target. In spring 2009, 10 junior students presented with scores ranging from 79% to 90% with 4 students meeting the achievement target.

**M 2: Capstone Course (O: 1)**

RT 4085 is a critical thinking through writing capstone course that concentrates on a series of reflective assignments designed to allow the senior student to demonstrate improvement in clinical thinking and writing skills.

**Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Communication**

Students should achieve average course grade of 85% or higher.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Forty-five students completed RT 4085 in Spring semester 2009. Thirty-nine or 87% achieved an average course grade or higher.

**M 3: Mid-Program Comprehensive exam (O: 2)**

Upon completion of the first year of the respiratory therapy program, students will demonstrate competent understanding of advanced level skills. This exam is given at the end of the summer semester via a web-based format.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Advancing respiratory therapy skills**

Score of 75% or above

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students scored above the achievement target. Grades ranged from 75 to 95 with average score = 84.

**M 4: NBRC Entry Level CRT (O: 2)**

All students must successfully pass the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) Certified Respiratory Therapist exam to demonstrate cognitive mastery of entry level skills. This exam allows for licensure in the State of Georgia. Provided in web-based format.

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O2: Advancing respiratory therapy skills**

At least 90% of students taking CRT exam will pass on their first attempt. Passing score is determined by NBRC.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

During spring semester 2009, 33 out of 36 seniors passed the exam on the first attempt (92%).

**M 5: NBRC Written Registry Exam (O: 3)**

Measure of cognitive mastery on advanced therapist skills and procedures taken in last semester prior to graduation, and involves recall, application and analysis items. This is a web-based exam.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy**

90% of graduating students will pass this exam on their first attempt. Passing score is determined by NBRC.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

94% or 30/33 graduating students passed the Written Registry exam on first attempt.

**M 6: NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam (O: 3)**

Web-based exam which requires mastery of higher-level patient management ability, including therapeutic procedure initiation and modification.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy**

90% of graduating students will pass exam on their first attempt. Passing score is determined by the NBRC.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

22/31 graduating students or 71% passed the CSE on the first attempt.

---

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

**Capstone course**
This past spring, this capstone course was piloted as a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course. This course will be taught again next spring and lessons learned from the pilot findings will be incorporated into the curriculum. Will continue to monitor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Course
  Outcome/Objective: Communication
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Additional Resources: GTA as a CTW assistant for office hours and other assistance for students.
Budget Amount Requested: $2,000.00 (recurring)

Case presentation
Based on last year's report, standards were increased from an average target of 88% to 90% for all students. From the CTW course schedule for the junior year, written case studies with critical thinking is required. Oral case presentation follow this CTW course. Will continue to monitor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Case Presentation
  Outcome/Objective: Communication
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

NBRC Clinical Simulation Exam
From the action plan of 2007/08, we now require passage of this exam as a graduation requirement beginning in 2010. Practice clinical simulation exam software has been integrated into RT courses. Will continue to require students to complete practice simulations.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Additional Resources: Funding to purchase exam for 45 students. Exam costs $190 each.
Budget Amount Requested: $8,550.00 (recurring)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
1. Will continue to monitor all target goals.
2. More integration of RT software into course work is needed for student success.
3. Will require (as opposed to encourage) students to seek assistance with lab tutor when weaknesses are seen throughout semester.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Students are required to pass three NBRC exams as a graduation requirement beginning with cohort that entered Fall 2008. Educational software was purchased and incorporated into RT courses as appropriate.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Two of the three exams have acceptable pass rates. Improvement is still needed in the last exam which is the one that requires the greatest amount of critical thinking.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Lab Tutor is available for extra help in an open lab format two afternoons a week.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Information is useful for faculty to understand how their efforts are helping the department meet accreditation and other goals.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Expect to meet all targets by continuing strategies established last year. Will use funding to purchase exams for students, if available.
Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Master of Science degree in Health Sciences with a concentration in Respiratory Therapy is to expand the knowledge of current and future respiratory therapists who will be the leaders and educators in the profession of respiratory care.

Goals
G 1: MS Respiratory Therapy Goals
Our goals for student learning include: 1) students become critical and ethical thinkers 2) students are knowledgeable about the professional issues of respiratory care 3) students are prepared for leadership positions in healthcare settings where respiratory care is practiced 4) students will be prepared for educational position in academic institutions and/or healthcare settings.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Communication in respiratory care (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will be able to: 1) communicate orally by presenting a patient case study to the faculty and their peers which is logically organized based on data found in medical records and/or oral interviews or through debates on issues affecting the practice of respiratory care. 2) communicate in writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline through problem solving by addressing issues affecting the practice of respiratory care.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
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
1.14 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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Critical thinking in the application of research (M: 2)
An entry-level understanding in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Understanding Health Policy in the United States (M: 3)
Evaluate contemporary principles in health policy in the US and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services.

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
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care (O: 1)**

Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge through debates, case presentations or projects presented orally or through end-of-semester writing assignments in the core master's curriculum (RT 6030, 7030, 7095).

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Communication in respiratory care**

Score at least 90% as graded by instructor or advisor on written final exams, literature reviews, or project presentations in the core master’s courses.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% (6/6) scored at least 90% or higher as graded by the instructor on final exam or project for advanced core courses.

**M 2: Demonstrate appreciation for the research process (O: 1, 2)**

Either through thesis or graduate project, oral communication and writing skills competence by faculty evaluation during thesis defense or presentation of project.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Communication in respiratory care**

Successful thesis defense or project presentation as presented to thesis committee or RT faculty.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Since last report, three thesis defenses and two project presentations have been successful.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking in the application of research**

At least 75% of graduate students will choose thesis option.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Sixty percent (3/5) graduate students completing the master's program chose the thesis option.

**M 3: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 1, 3)**

Students will show mastery of contemporary concepts by participation in class discussions, debates, and successful completion of final written exam in HHS 8000 - Trends affecting Health Policy.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Communication in respiratory care**

Final exam score of 90% or higher

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fall 2008, six RT graduate students completed HHS 8000 with a final exam score of 90% or higher.

**Target for O3: Understanding Health Policy in the United States**

Students will show mastery of concepts by successful passage of comprehensive written final exam in HHS 8000 - Trends affecting Health Policy.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% (6/6) students enrolled in HHS 8000 Fall semester 2008 passed the final exam with 90% or higher.

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

**Rubric Development**

Continue development of rubric for evaluation of thesis proposals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Demonstrate appreciation for the research process | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical thinking in the application of research

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** RT Faculty

**Thesis option**

At least 75% of graduate students will choose thesis option as opposed to project option for completion of master's degree.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Will follow action plan outlined in report.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Completed integration of Intergrated BS/MS program. First 4 graduates will finish summer semester 2010.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
More refinement of thesis process in terms of advisement and mentoring is needed to facilitate successful completion of student thesis.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
A new tenure-track faculty member joined our division in August 2008. This has helped to even the workload of student advisement and thesis mentoring.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Our goals are workable and will continue to works towards completion.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We anticipate to meet our goals. The master’s program is experiencing growth so our goals and action plans will be monitoring often for improvement.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
MISSION The MS RMI degree with a Specialization in Mathematical Risk Management (MRM program) prepares students for careers in quantitative risk management and financial engineering positions emphasizing risk management. Graduates will be qualified for positions in a variety of organizational settings including financial institutions, risk management consultancies, and in the treasury departments of non-financial corporations. The program achieves these goals by emphasizing the application of mathematics in economics and finance to address contemporary risk management problems through the appropriate diagnosis, analysis, pricing, and customization of solutions to risk management problems and opportunities broadly defined to include both financial and operational risk exposures. The MRM program differentiates itself from an MBA with a concentration in Risk Management and Insurance through: More rigorous coverage of mathematical and statistical theory, The development of programming skills in a variety of programming languages and econometric software, and Specific emphasis on the development of modeling skills of the financial and operational risk exposures of both of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities, asset-backed securities, and other complex financially engineered assets.

Goals
G 1: Students will develop technical expertise in specified areas
Students will develop an adequate level of technical expertise in the areas of financial economics, insurance economics, actuarial science and modern risk management theory.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in mathematical and statistical theory to quantify and analyze various financial and operational stochastic risk exposures.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2: Economic and financial theory expertise (G: 1, 3) (M: 3)**

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will have the technical expertise in economic and financial theory to determine the value of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities and to document the risks associated with the securities.

**O/O 3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 4, 5)**

The MS-RMI (MRM) graduate will be able to draw upon theory from financial economics, insurance economics, actuarial science and modern risk management to develop firm-wide integrated risk management models capable of analyzing the costs and opportunities of a firm's various risk exposures. Students will be able to: 1. Recommend the risks that should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm's objectives. 2. Identify the limitations of the models and therefore the associated risks of those limitations along with strategies to manage these exposures.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Exams in MRM 8320 (O: 1) | Each student will demonstrate expertise in the quantification and analysis of operational stochastic risk exposures through responses to selected questions from course exams in MRM 8320 Introduction to Stochastic Risk Management Models. |
| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) | **Target for O1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random sample of student exams submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.  
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**  
Copies of student exam responses not retained in 2008-2009 because revised assessment plan finalized after conclusion of 2008-2009 version of the course. Findings will begin with 2009-2010 offering of the course. |

| M 2: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 (O: 1) | Through performance on selected projects in ECON 8780 Financial Econometrics, each student will demonstrate technical expertise in mathematical and statistical theory to quantify and analyze various financial stochastic risk exposures. |
| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) | **Target for O1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random sample of student projects submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.  
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**  
Copies of student projects not retained in 2008-2009 because revised assessment plan finalized after conclusion of 2008-2009 version of the course. Findings will begin with 2009-2010 offering of the course. |

| M 3: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 (O: 2) | Through performance on selected projects and exam questions in MRM 8610 Financial Engineering, each student will demonstrate the technical expertise in economic and financial theory to determine the value of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities and to document the risks associated with the securities. |
| Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) | **Target for O2: Economic and financial theory expertise**  
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random sample of selected exam responses submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.  
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met** |
For 2008-2009, the average on the selected projects and exams was 2.5 for Criterion 1, 2.7 for Criterion 2, and 2.1 for Criterion 3.

M 4: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 (O: 3)

Through performance on selected case work in RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management, each student will demonstrate the ability to recommend appropriately the risks that should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm's objectives.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE FOUR RUBRIC to a random sample of student case work submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

The 2008-2009 average on Criterion 1 was 2.5; on Criterion it was 2.0.

M 5: Selected projects in MRM 8620 (O: 3)

Through performance on selected projects in MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Models, each student will demonstrate the ability to identify the limitations of the risk management models and therefore the associated risks of those limitations along with strategies to manage these exposures.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE FIVE RUBRIC to a random sample of student projects submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Copies of student projects not retained in 2008-2009 because revised assessment plan finalized after conclusion of 2008-2009 version of the course. Findings will begin with 2009-2010 offering of the course.

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

**Continue retention of exams/projects**

Continue to retain selected student exams and projects for four years. Aggregate increasing collection of annual data until achieve four-year data sample. Maintain rolling four-year data sample thereafter.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 | Outcome/Objective: Economic and financial theory expertise
  - Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
  - Responsible Person/Group: Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
  - Additional Resources: None
  - Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Retain and evaluate student work**

Retain selected samples of applicable student work from 2009-2010 course offerings. Perform preliminary analysis of the same for 2009-2010 assessment report.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Exams in MRM 8320 | Outcome/Objective: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise
  - Measure: Selected projects in MRM 8620 | Outcome/Objective: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models
  - Measure: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 | Outcome/Objective: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models
  - Measure: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 | Outcome/Objective: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise
  - Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  - Responsible Person/Group: Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
  - Additional Resources: None
  - Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Mission / Purpose
A substantially revise version of this program is in the midst of the approval process. An appropriate assessment plan will be prepared and implemented once the program revisions have been approved and implemented.

Goals
G 1: See Mission/Purpose

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: See Mission/Purpose (M: 1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: See Mission/Purpose (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: See Mission/Purpose
Complete approval of revisions to program. Revise assessment plan in light of revised program. Implement revised assessment plan.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
Awaiting final approval of program revisions.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Program Revision Approval
Achieve approval of program revisions. Revise assessment plan to match revised program. Begin implementation of revised plan.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: See Mission/Purpose | Outcome/Objective: See Mission/Purpose
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Phillips and Marty Grace
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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Mission / Purpose
BBA-RMI PROGRAM MISSION: The BBA in Risk Management and Insurance (RMI) is designed to prepare students to: (1) Apply quantitative models to the measurement of business risks, (2) Assess the hazard risks that are common to business organizations, (3) Apply the enterprise risk management process to managing risk in business organizations.

Goals
G 1: Quantify business risk using modeling tools
Students will be able to quantify business risk by applying appropriate modeling tools.

G 2: Assess common business risks
Students will be able to assess the common property, liability and personnel risks of a business organization.

G 3: Apply forecasting techniques to loss data
Students will be able to apply forecasting techniques to loss data to project the future impact of risks on a business organization.

G 4: Apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options
Students will be able to apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options as an aid in decision-making.
G 5: Explain and apply enterprise risk management process
Students will be able to explain the enterprise risk management process and apply it to actual business situations through case study.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identification and structuring of risky situations (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to recognize risk and uncertainty and their impact on individual, business, and societal decision making. Pertinent risks include those related to the person and property, leverage, longevity, securing future consumption, and asset transfer. Students will be able to take an uncertain situation and determine the nature of the problem(s) to be solved.

SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and: (1) recognize mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving; and (2) use quantitative tools to model risks and craft alternatives to address them.

SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students will have technical comprehension of the business risk management process, including the identification and evaluation of loss exposures, the analysis of the various risk control and financing techniques available to manage the exposures, decision making under conditions of uncertainty, control mechanisms to monitor the results of the risk management program.

SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)
Students will have theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. Students will be able to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Identification and structuring of risky situations
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 2: Selected Projects and identified exam questions in RMI 4300 (O: 3)
Students will be given the task of identifying and prioritizing the hazard risks of a given business organization through the use of a Risk Mapping approach to risk assessment.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 Enterprise Risk Management theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process and the ability to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.
Mission / Purpose

The Mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration (BBA) program is to provide broad general education and the core business knowledge and skills to prepare both traditional and non-traditional students for entry-level position in public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and to stimulate in students a desire for life-long learning.

This was actually established as the mission of the BBA program in the 2004-2005 cycle. The new WEAVE program simply did not carry it forward.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Appreciation of Life-long Learning (M: 1)**
Students will exhibit a positive attitude toward continual learning upon completion of the BBA program.

**SLO 2: Effective Team Membership (M: 2, 3)**
Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.

**SLO 3: Effective Communication Skills (M: 4, 5, 7)**
Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

**SLO 4: Effective Analytical Skills (M: 6)**
Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.

**SLO 5: Effective Use of Computer Technology (M: 7)**
Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Further Education – Self Report (O: 1)**
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 O1: Appreciation of Life-long Learning**
Over 60% of students show an interest in continuing their formal education in some form in the future. Measurement will be done by looking at self report data entered for the Educational Testing Service's Business Test, which is administered to graduating seniors in their final semester.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
In Fall Semester 2008, 353 students responded to this question, with 55.4% of the respondents indication that they planned on pursuing further formal education. Of those not indicating an interest in further education 33/157 or a bit over one-fifth listed themselves as undecided. The remainder indicated that they would no the pursuing education beyond their bachelors degree.

In Spring Semester 2009, 393 students responded to this question, with 60.3% of the respondents indication that they planned on pursuing further formal education. Of those not indicating an interest in further education 47/156 or a bit less than one-third listed themselves as undecided. The remainder indicated that they would not be pursuing education beyond their bachelors degree.

**M 2: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 2)**
Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Occasionally carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets
all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Effective Team Membership

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

All students in the capstone BUSA 4980 classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 25 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Each form reported evaluations for three to five students, including the evaluator, on nine measures. A total of 113 evaluations were used here. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. A rubric was given to each student characterizing the behavior in each of the five categories on each of the nine measures. For this measure the Involvement score was used. The mean for the 113 evaluation forms was 3.92. The mean for all 113 evaluation forms was 3.92. The mean for the 113 evaluation forms was 3.92. The variation was 1.0666. The distribution showed a Skew of -0.846 and a Kurtosis of 0.42. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric; however it showed a clear peak. The mean score was below the target level of 4.00

M 3: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 2)

Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Effective Team Membership

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

All students in the capstone BUSA 4980 classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 25 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Each form reported evaluations for three to five students, including the evaluator, on nine measures. A total of 113 evaluations were used here. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. A rubric was given to each student characterizing the behavior in each of the five categories on each of the nine measures. For this measure the Involvement score was used. The mean for the 113 evaluation forms was 4.30. The mean for all 113 evaluation forms was 3.92. The variation was 0.90866. The distribution showed a Skew of -1.646 and a Kurtosis of 2.72. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric; however it showed a clear peak. The mean score was above the target level of 4.00

M 4: Oral Communications Skills (O: 3)

This measure contains three sub-parts that respectively look at the alignment of the material and method of the presentation with the audience, the synthesis and arrangement of the content presented, and the overall effectiveness of the student's oral presentation style and behavior. Measure I will be used. Measure I is: a Skew of -1.646 and a Kurtosis of 2.72. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric; however it showed a clear peak. The mean score was above the target level of 4.00

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
**Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills**

On all three sub-parts’ criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the final oral student presentations done as part of the BBA program’s capstone course, BUSA 4980.

**M 5: Written Communication Skills (O: 3)**

This measure contains two sub-parts that respectively look at the synthesis and arrangement of the content presented, and the overall effectiveness of the student’s written presentation style and behavior. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to Critical Thinking through Writing assignments collected from the second (i.e. senior level) CTW designated class in each major in the Robinson College of Business. Measure 5: Effective Communication Skills: Students can …

**Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills**

On both sub-parts’ criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to Critical Thinking through Writing assignments collected from the second (i.e. senior level) CTW designated class in each major in the Robinson College of Business.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Initial review of CTW class papers show that only 54.5% of students met the standard for writing. This is a small sample at this time. Further assignments from other majors are forthcoming and will be added. Review of rubric rigor will also be in order.

**M 6: Effective Analytical Skills (O: 4)**

Measure 6 Effective Analytical Skills Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i Select the process of critical thinking to problem solving rather than other thinking processes when solving problems. Student always applies the processes of critical thinking and does not employ other, less-effective decision-making, thinking processes when solving problems. Student largely applies on the process of critical thinking and rarely employs other, less-effective decision-making, thinking processes when solving problems. Student only partly applies the process of critical thinking and meaningfully employs other, less-effective decision-making, thinking processes when solving problems. Student does not apply the process of critical thinking when solving problems. ii The ability to define problems effectively. Student presents the ability to identify the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student presents the ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents a weak ability to identify the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student presents the ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents a weak ability to identify the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. iii. The ability to interpret data effectively. Student presents the ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student presents the ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents the ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents a weak ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand. Student shows very limited or no ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand. iv. The ability to solve problems effectively. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively present a solution to the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively present a solution to the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively present a solution to the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents a weak ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively present a solution to the problem at hand. Student shows very limited or no ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively present a solution to the problem at hand.

**Target for O4: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on all four sub-parts of the Effective Analytical skills rubric Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric to Critical Thinking through Writing assignments collected from the second (i.e. senior level) CTW designated class in each major in the Robinson College of Business.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

Students in the initial review of CTW assignments failed to achieve the goal on any of the 4 measures. Actual percentages ranged from 72% on “ability to define problems effectively,” to 27% for “ability to interpret data effectively.” More assignments will have to be brought in to enlarge the number of observations. If the high failure rate continues a review of the rigor of the rubric may be in order. If the differences among the topics persist, however, there will clearly have to be attention paid to the differences, particularly the low use of data available for analysis.

**M 7: Ability to Use Technology (O: 3, 5)**

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

**Target for O3: Effective Communication 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All goals were met. On both questions students scored above the mean in all three comparison classifications. On Q 67 student mean in 2008 was 5.41 on a 7 point scale. That compares favorably to the 5.30 mean in 2007. On Q 67 student mean in 2008 was 5.29 on a 7 point scale. That compares favorably to the 5.17 mean in 2007. Data for the 2009 exit survey will be available in July 2009 and the findings here will be updated accordingly.
**Target for O5: Effective Use of Computer Technology**

On both of these questions students should score above the mean for the classifications of Select Six Peer Institutions, Carnegie Class Institutions, and All Participating Institutions. On both of these questions student scores will improve year-on-year.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All goals were met. Students were above a majority of schools in all three classifications on both questions. On Q 67 students rated their ability at 5.41 in 2008, which is an improvement over 5.30 in the 2007 survey. On Q 67 students rated their ability at 5.29 in 2008, which is an improvement over 5.17 in the 2007 survey. 2009 data will be available in July or August 2009 and will be used to update these results.

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

**Law and Ethics**

In the 2008-2009 AY the Undergraduate Steering Committee recommended the addition of a law and ethics component to the Learning Outcomes of the Undergraduate degree program and the Assessment process. In the next assessment cycle the following will be done: A Learning Outcome, Measurement Rubric, and Target Performance level will be established for the Undergraduate program. Elements of law and ethics will be infused into the capstone strategic management course, BUSA 4980. A case with significant law and ethics issues will be woven into the materials in the capstone strategy course, BUSA 4980. An assessment of students’ performance on the law and ethics infused case will be made and based on the results the next set of steps will be taken to establish law and ethic orientations throughout the undergraduate curriculum.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BUSA 4980 faculty, RCB Assessment committee, UG Steering Committee
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The College has begun working with the Coordinator the BUSA 4980 course on all of the changes that will involve that course. The College Assessment Committee is working on developing new rubrics for Oral and Written Communication skills with the help of the College’s Business Communications faculty members.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Written and Oral Communication measurements were changed. A new rubric was developed in both cases. The Critical Thinking through Writing courses were established as the venue for Written Communication skill assessment.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The College has added a requirement for law and ethics activities. Law and ethics materials will be added in the strategic management class (BUSA 4980) and a case exercise that includes significant law and ethics issues will be added to the syllabus. The College has changed the exercises used in assessing Written Communication Skills. The Critical Thinking through Writing exercises will no longer be used. CTW exercises varied significantly across majors with a resulting wide range of prose writing being required by different departments. Further, not all students were graduating seniors in the CTW classes so it was difficult to truly assess exit skills. The written case exercise in the capstone BUSA 4980 strategic management class will be substituted. This class will provide a common, prose oriented writing exercise for all students and all students will be graduating seniors. The College will also revise the rubric that will be used to assess Written Communication skills. The College has changed the format requirements for the Oral Communication Skills assessment. The oral presentations are a common exercise requirement in the BUSA 4980 course; however the manner in which the presentations were made was not consistent and in many cases did not permit effective assessment of individual student’s skills. The College will also revise the rubric that will be used to assess Oral Communication skills. Written and Oral Communication measurements were changed. A new rubric was developed in both cases. The Critical Thinking through Writing courses were established as the venue for Written Communication skill assessment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The College moved the Assessment of the Communication Skills to the College Assessment Committee. This led to the evaluations that showed the format of the assessed activities as well as the rubrics used in that activity was inadequate.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
The College Assessment Committee proved to be useful for some activities such as the focus on Undergraduate Communication skills. However, the organization of the Committee could be significantly improved to more effectively employ the members' skills on other issues. This will have to be addressed to effectively launch the new initiative on Computer Skills while sustaining the efforts in Communication Skills.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The College Assessment Committee proved to be a very effective improvement in the ability to assess the Oral Communication Skills issues. This will be continued and future assignments will be given to the Committee as the Communication issues became better addressed in practice and a new agenda item is identified.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Robinson College of Business MBA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Robinson: Right Questions, Rigorous Analysis, Real Solutions. Preparing students to excel as global business leaders. This revision of the MBA programs mission was approved by the MBA steering committee in December of 2008.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions (M: 1, 2)**

The student should be able to identify, prioritize and focus on critical success factors for a business unit and to analyze an organization's resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - 4 Critical Thinking
- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions (M: 3, 4, 5)**

The student should be able to develop viable competitive strategies, present a reasoned analysis and justify recommendations that integrate functional, global, legal and ethical dimensions in the business decision process.

- **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
  - 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Students can Lead and Implement Solutions (M: 6, 7)**

The student should be able to demonstrate leadership skills by contributing expertise to challenging the status quo, proposed solutions and organizational assumptions. The student should be able to conduct a post-audit to determine key outcomes that supported or refuted management's action and to propose suggestions for next steps.

- **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
- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**O/O: 4 Students can Collaborate with their Constituents (M: 8, 9)**

The student should be able to contribute as a productive member of a management-level work team that is responsible for a specified task including recognizing dysfunctional dynamics in a team and be able to cooperatively solve those with other team members.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Collaboration

**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: Critical Success Factor Analysis (O: 1)**

**Measure 1 Students Can Analyze Relevant Questions**: Critical Success Factor Analysis Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) Identify Critical Success Factors Student can identify almost all Critical Success Factors in a situation with almost no superfluous factors included. Student can identify most Critical Success factors but includes some superfluous factors. Student can identify some Critical Success factors but includes many superfluous factors. Student can not sufficiently distinguish Critical Success Factors from other elements in the situation. i. Prioritize Critical Success Factors Student can prioritize almost all of Critical Success Factors in a situation with almost no superfluous factors included. Student can prioritize most of the Critical Success factors that are identified. Student has difficulty prioritizing most of the Critical Success factors that are identified. Student can not prioritize Critical Success Factors. iii. Focus On Critical Success Factors

Student's presentation focuses on the Critical Success Factors identified and provides emphasis in the correct priority. Student's presentation focuses on many of the Critical Success Factors with a general emphasis based on priority. Student's presentation focuses on only a few of the Critical Success Factors with little attention to priority. Student's presentation largely fails to focus on the Critical Success Factors.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions**

On all three sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

**Findings** 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

Students did not reach the goal of 80% at the 3-out-of-4 level on any of the three sub-parts. This may be due to the rigor with which the rubric was applied. Students scored highest on the ability to identify the Critical Success Factors with 70% of the students reaching the 3-out-of-4 level. The ability to Focus their paper on the Critical Success factors was met with 62.5% of the students. The weakest of the skills was the Prioritization of the Critical Success factors with a 50% rating.

**M 2: Environmental Opportunity Analysis (O: 1)**

**Measure 2 Students Can Analyze Relevant Questions**: Environmental Opportunity Analysis Students Ability to: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Understand a Firm's Resources and Capabilities Student's understanding reflects ability to accurately categorize, analyze and discuss. Student's understanding reflects strong ability to accurately identify and describe. Student's understanding reflects weak ability to accurately identify, describe and explain. Student's understanding reflects no or very little ability to accurately identify, describe and explain. ii. Analyze of a Firm's Competitive Environment based on the understanding of the Resources and Capabilities Student can accurately appraise, assess and interpret the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment. Student can accurately appraise, assess and interpret the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment. Student can accurately appraise, assess and interpret the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment. Student can accurately appraise, assess and interpret the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment. Student shows no or little ability to accurately identify, and describe the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions**

On both sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

**Findings** 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

Students did not reach the goal of 80% at the 3-out-of-4 level on either of the two sub-parts. This may be due to the rigor with which the rubric was applied. On the ability to Understand the firm's resources and Capabilities students were at the 3-out-of-4 level on 62.5% of the papers. When that Understanding was applied to the Competitive environments for Analysis the number of students meeting the standard fell to 58.3%.

**M 3: Student Ability to Develop Corporate Strategies (O: 2)**

**Measure 3 Students Can Propose Alternative Solutions**: Ability to develop corporate strategies Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Integration of functional dimensions Student fully and effectively integrates all major functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student includes multiple functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student only includes some of the functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student fails to include functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student's presentation largely fails to focus on the Critical Success Factors.

ii. Integration of legal dimensions Student fully and effectively integrates all major legal dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student only includes some of the legal dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student fails to include global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student's presentation largely fails to focus on the Critical Success Factors.

iii. Integration of ethical dimensions Student fully and effectively integrates all major ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student only includes some of the ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student fails to include global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student's presentation largely fails to focus on the Critical Success Factors.

iv. Integration of social dimensions Student fully and effectively integrates all major social dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student only includes some of the social dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student fails to include global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student's presentation largely fails to focus on the Critical Success Factors.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions**

On both sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.
all major ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student includes multiple ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student only includes some of the ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student fails to include ethical dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions

On all four sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

One challenge in evaluating the students answers is that in none of the three alternative research foci firms from which the students could choose was there a clear ethical issue to address. Students had to raise this issue on their own, although some did. None of them integrated the ethical dimension to the “3” level resulting in 0% on all ethical measures in all rubrics. Legal foci were also limited in emphasis on the three alternative cases. There was, however, an opportunity to discuss law, legislation and regulation in each case, however the level of integration was often low resulting in only 12.5% of the students reaching the “3” level in Corporate Strategy Development. Global dimensions were very clear in two of the three cases and the context was global for the industry of the third. Thus there was no reason for global dimensions to not be included. Disappointingly the level that rose to a “3” level in Corporate Strategy Development in 20.8% of the papers. Functional dimensions were in all discussions of Corporate Strategy Development, with some papers very well done. However, across the whole sample the percentage of papers at the 3-out-of-4 level was only at 45.8%, well below the goal of 80%. Further data will be collected from classes in the Summer Semester of 2009 and included at that time with this data for a more comprehensive analysis, although no real change is expected with the same questions being given and evaluated in the same way.

M 4: Student Ability to Present a Reasoned Analysis (O: 2)

Measure 4 Students Can Propose Alternative Solutions: Ability to present a reasoned analysis Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Integration of functional dimensions Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes all major functional dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to legal dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to global dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes major functional dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. ii. Integration of global dimensions Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes all major global dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to legal dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to legal dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to functional dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. iii. Integration of legal dimensions Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes all major legal dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions

On all four sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

One challenge in evaluating the students answers is that in none of the three alternative research foci firms from which the students could choose was there a clear ethical issue to address. Students had to raise this issue on their own, although some did. None of them integrated the ethical dimension to the “3” level resulting in 0% on all ethical measures in all rubrics. Legal foci were also limited in emphasis on the three alternative cases. There was, however, an opportunity to discuss law, legislation and regulation in each case, however the level of integration was often low resulting in only 20.8% of the students reaching the “3” level on the Ability to Present a Reasoned Analysis dimension. Integration of ethical dimensions Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to the major ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to major ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to legal dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a comprehensive and tightly reasoned analysis that includes ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a weakly reasoned analysis with respect to ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative. Student presents a well reasoned analysis with respect to ethical dimensions in the development of a strategic alternative.

M 5: Student Ability to Justify their Recommendations (O: 2)

Measure 5 Students Can Propose Alternative Solutions: Ability to justify their recommendations Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Integration of functional dimensions Student fully integrates all major functional dimensions in their recommendations Student meaningfully integrates most functional dimensions in their recommendations Student only limitedly integrates functional dimensions in their recommendations Student fails to integrate functional dimensions in their recommendations ii. Integration of global dimensions Student fully integrates global dimensions in their recommendations Student meaningfully integrates global dimensions in their recommendations Student only limitedly integrates global dimensions in their recommendations Student fails to integrate global dimensions in their recommendations iii. Integration of legal dimensions Student fully integrates legal dimensions in their recommendations Student meaningfully integrates legal dimensions in their recommendations Student only limitedly integrates legal dimensions in their recommendations Student fails to integrate legal dimensions in their recommendations iv. Integration of ethical dimensions Student fully integrates ethical dimensions in their recommendations Student only limitedly integrates ethical dimensions in their recommendations Student fails to integrate ethical dimensions in their recommendations

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions

On all four sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

Students did not reach the goal of 80% at the 3-out-of-4 level on any of the four sub-parts. This may be due, in part, to the rigor with which the rubric was applied and, in part, to the focus on some issues in the assignments analyzed. Part of the weakness in the Ability to Justify Recommendations was the students' reluctance at time to MAKE recommendations. One challenge in evaluating the students answers is that in none of the three alternative research foci firms from which the students could choose was there a clear ethical issue to address. Students had to raise this issue on their own, although some did. None of them integrated the ethical dimension to the "3" level resulting in a 0% on all ethical measures in all rubrics. Legal foci were also limited in emphasis on the three alternative cases. There was, however, an opportunity to discuss law, legislation and regulation in each case, however the level of integration was often low resulting in only 16.7% of the students reaching the "3" level on the Ability to Present a Reasoned Analysis dimension. Global dimensions were very clear in two of the three cases and the context was global for the industry of the third. Thus there was no reason for global dimensions to not be included. On this dimension the level that rose to a "3" level on the Ability to Justify Recommendations in 20.8% of the papers. Functional dimensions were in all discussions of the Ability to Justify Recommendations, with some papers very well done. However, across the whole sample the percentage of papers at the 3-out-of-4 level was 56.5%, still below the goal of 80%. Further data will be collected from classes in the Summer Semester of 2009 and included at that time with this data for a more comprehensive analysis, although no real change is expected with the same questions being given and evaluated in the same way.

M 6: Student Can Lead and Implement Solutions (O: 3)

Measure 6 Students Can Lead and Implement Solutions: Challenging the status quo Students Ability to: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i) Challenging the status quo, actions, and/or proposed solutions and organizational assumptions. Successfully set out clearly prioritized actions and the thoughtful critique of management action in the case or situation being analyzed. Student presents an adequate critique of management action in the case or situation being analyzed. Student presents a partial but meaningfully deficient critique of management action in the case or situation being analyzed. Student fails to present more than a minimal critique of management action in the case or situation being analyzed.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Students can Lead and Implement Solutions

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

On this measure 67% of the students met the standard of 3-out-of-4, below the 80% target.

M 7: Student Ability to Conduct a Post-audit (O: 3)

Measure 7 Students Can Lead and Implement Solutions: Conduct a post-audit Students Ability to: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i) Conduct a post audit of management's actions in a case or assignment Student can accurately audit the whole array of actions of the managers in a situation being analyzed with correct levels of emphasis. Student can accurately audits many but not all of the important actions of the managers in a situation being analyzed. Student inaccurately audits the important actions of the managers in a situation being analyzed, by omission, misidentification and/or poor prioritization Student fails to meaningfully audit the important actions of the managers in a situation being analyzed. ii) Propose subsequent steps that follow on the management actions audited Student can clearly set out correctly-prioritized actions that are tautly linked to the conclusions of the post audit. Student can set out important actions that are linked to the conclusions of the post audit. Student has difficulty setting out important actions or linking these actions to the conclusions of the post audit. Student sets out few or no actions to be taken with little or no linking of these actions to the conclusions of the post audit.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Students can Lead and Implement Solutions

On both sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

On both parts of the measure students only met the 3-out-of-4 level of performance 53.3% of the time, which is well below the 80% goal. As with other measures, Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 this may be due, in part, to the rigor with which the rubric was applied.

M 8: Ability to Work on a Team (O: 4)

Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other members. Gives no task support to other members. Occasionally gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 9 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-85% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Occasionally carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 8 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group
discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Considers the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Students can Collaborate with their Constituents

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met

All students in the capstone classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 15 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Each form reported evaluations for three peer students on nine measures. A total of 46 evaluations were used here. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. A rubric was given to each student characterizing the behavior in each of the five categories on each of the nine measures. For this measure the Involvement score was used. The mean for the 46 evaluations was 3.94. The variation was 0.706. The distribution showed a Skew of -0.482 and a Kurtosis of -0.152. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric. The mean score was below the target level of 4.00.

M 9: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)

Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that, consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 9 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member’s attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 8 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Students can Collaborate with their Constituents

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

All students in the capstone classes participated in the semester-long group project from which 15 peer review forms were randomly sampled. Each form reported evaluations for three peer students on nine measures. A total of 46 evaluations were used here. Each measure contained a possible score of 1 to 5. A rubric was given to each student characterizing the behavior in each of the five categories on each of the nine measures. For this measure the Involvement score was used. The mean for the 46 evaluations was 4.00. The variation was 0.565. The distribution showed a Skew of -0.321 and a Kurtosis of -0.152. These last two numbers indicate that the measures results were asymmetric. The mean score was below the target level of 4.00.

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

Law and Ethics

The assessment process of 2008-2009 showed very low scores in the area of law and ethics. Two possible interpretations of this result are possible. One is that the measurement was flawed; the second is that the measurement was fine and the learning objective was not being attained. Upon review it seems that the answer is a mix of the two items. Some of the alternative exercises that students could choose from in the assessed assignment did not have clear legal or ethical issues for discussion. However, on the options that did have such concerns the level of discussion was below target levels. In the short term the assignments for the assessment will be more carefully vetted to see that opportunities for discussion of legal and/or ethical issues are clearly set out. In the longer term the leadership of the College will work with Department toward increased consideration of legal and ethical issues in decision making throughout the core curriculum, not just in the Legal Environment course.
Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

The assessment process on the measures of Leadership and Group Participation was not helpful in terms of providing results to the College that will enable them to target specific aspects of both skill sets for improvement. Analysis of the rubric used for these measurements indicated a sophisticated measure embedded in a good measurement devise for both measures. Analysis of the data collected from students indicates, however, that students were using the measurement instruments in a very elementary way. For the 09-10 assessment cycle it would be preferable if the assessment instrument can be retained. The challenge is to elicit more thoughtful and reflective responses from students in their completion of the assessment instrument. The College will work with the faculty members in the Strategic Management class to try to improve participation quality in this class.

Analysis of the data collected from students indicates, however, that students were using the measurement instruments in a very elementary way. For the 09-10 assessment cycle it would be preferable if the assessment instrument can be retained. The challenge is to elicit more thoughtful and reflective responses from students in their completion of the assessment instrument. The College will work with the faculty members in the Strategic Management class to try to improve participation quality in this class.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2**: Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Work will be done on both of the major improvement trusts by having the College work with the MBA steering Committee, and, importantly, with the faculty members who are teaching the MBA capstone course in which the assessment activities emphasized are undertaken. Working with those faculty to see that assignments and the administration of the measurement instruments are most effectively executed will be critical to developing more reliable information of the achievement of the student learning outcomes targeted. Longer term, for the emphasis on ethics and law throughout the core curriculum, efforts will have to include a focus on Department Chairs where the core courses are housed. Success in this change, which is also being sought on the undergraduate level, will require changes in each Department in terms of what they convey to faculty members with respect to course content expectations. Achievement will be on a Department by Department level.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1**: Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

For the assessment that was executed in the '08 - '09 academic year the College significantly revised all rubrics in order to shift assessment to an individual basis and to align the learning outcomes more tightly with program's mission statement. All of the rubrics used were new. The method of collecting data for many of the rubrics was also new.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2**: Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment used was challenging in terms of the student performance expectations. Few results were satisfactory based on the standards set in the rubrics. For the most part the College thought that the student learning outcomes, which were newly aligned with the MBA program's mission, were proper. There were some areas where there were measurement difficulties and these would be the first priority in continual improvement. These are set out in the Action Plan for the '09 -'10 cycle.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1**: Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The RCB Assessment process has improved. The Assessment Committee was reformed and clearer assessments were undertaken. This resulted in the revised rubrics that were used throughout the MBA program. These changes completely changed the learning outcomes that were being measured and the methods by which they were measured.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2**: Leadership and Team Skill Measurement

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The revised Assessment Committee was partial effective in '08 - '09 relative to its goals. Some excellent members with a solid understanding of assessment processes were identified and the significant improvements indicated in the '08 - '09 cycle can be directly attributed to those members contributions. Going into the '09 -'10 cycle the College will have to evaluate the administrative structure of the Assessment Process. This likely will mean a leaner Assessment Committee with fewer members working more closely with department assessment leaders and faculty members who are actually implementing the assessment processes.
The College has found that working one-on-one with Department Assessment leaders helps improve the precision of and enthusiasm for the assessment process. For the MBA program-wide assessment process this will require continued work with the MBA capstone course faculty members for the short term goals and with Department chairs for the longer term goals. For the short term goals set in the Action Plan, this is an increase in emphasis on this approach, which was begun in the '08 - '09 cycle. For the longer term Action Plan goals directed to the Law and Ethics learning outcome, this will constitute a new approach to bringing about curriculum changes tied to learning outcomes.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Ph.D. program of the College of Business Administration develops for graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring (1) training in theory; (2) training in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

**Goals**

**G1: Goals for Ph.D. in Business Administration Grads**

To place graduates in tenure-track academic or research institutions. To prepare graduates to do quality, relevant academic research and to publish and present their research in competitive academic journals and at top academic conferences. To prepare graduates to be effective teachers.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Comprehensive understanding of subject (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

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.

**O/O 2: Competency in research (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8)**

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.

**O/O 3: Mastery of methodology (M: 5, 6)**

Students are expected to have a firm grasp of quantitative and research methodology, including statistics, regression, research design and multivariate data analysis.

**O/O 4: Teaching excellence (M: 7)**

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.

**O/O 5: Professional Development and Academic Community (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)**

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.

**O/O 6: Placement in research-oriented institutions (M: 5, 6)**

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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1)**

Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 overall GPA and earn a C or better in all coursework.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 2: Preliminary Examination (O: 1)**

Upon completion of major field and quantitative/research methods coursework, all students will be given a comprehensive examination over all coursework. This examination is written, supplemented in some cases by an oral examination. Students will not be permitted a second attempt to pass the preliminary 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 the preliminary examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**M 3: Internal monitoring (O: 1, 2, 5)**

Each academic unit is encouraged to develop internal measures of academic performance such as additional papers and examinations. Students are encouraged to submit papers to academic journals and conferences.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 4: The Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 5)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to conduct a research program leading to a significant contribution to the discipline. The student’s dissertation proposal must be defended orally and include a summary of the following: The purpose of the study; the nature of the subject to be investigated and its importance; a brief review of the literature; the theory if any, to be developed; the empirical methodology, techniques, and data sources, if any, to be used; the nature of the hypotheses to be developed or tested, where appropriate; and a time frame for completion of the dissertation. When the dissertation committee judges the dissertation to be complete, it must be defended orally in a final dissertation defense. A unanimous decision of the committee is required to pass both the proposal and the final oral defense.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 5: Conference presentations and participation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)**

Students are encouraged to present original research at academic and professional conferences. The College helps fund student travel to such conferences. Participation in such activities often leads to offers of employment in tenure track positions.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 6: Research papers (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)**

Students are encouraged to do original and collaborative research and to submit papers for publication in academic journals.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 7: Teaching assignments (O: 1, 4)**

Students serve as graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). The student evaluations from the courses taught is used as feedback for honing teaching techniques. Students holding GTAs are registered for BA 9510. At the end of the semester, their performance is evaluated and they are assigned a grade of S or U.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 8: Research performance (O: 2)**

All Ph.D. students are given research assignments within their academic units. They are expected to maintain a consistent level of quality work. Students with graduate research assistantships (GRAs) are registered for BA 8510. At the end of the semester, the students’ performance is evaluated and grade of S or U is assigned.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. coordinators in each academic unit

**Pedagogical training**

All students who are slated to teach must take the Teaching Seminar course. Student evaluations from the courses taught by doctoral students are reviewed by the academic unit and discussed with the student. Each academic unit has a teaching mentor who works with students concerning all aspects of teaching, including course preparation and classroom management.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. unit coordinator and department 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ph.D. unit coordinator, Ph.D. Program Office
ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The Ph.D. Program office will work closely with each academic unit's coordinator to follow student progress.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The Ph.D. program is currently changing its curriculum to make it more relevant to the student and more responsive to the needs of the discipline. The college is developing guidelines for a minor in order to all students the choice of studying a complimentary area in addition to their designated major. The methodology courses are being reviewed and academic units are being given more flexibility to choose coursework that is specifically tailored to their discipline.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
As stated previously, the Ph.D. program is using this opportunity to make substantive changes to the curriculum to address student needs.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Last year, the Ph.D. Program hired a GRA to set up an online program of study for our students. That task is ongoing, with new student information being entered and updated as it is received. Ph.D. unit coordinators are able to see this information online and better monitor and advise their students.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
The findings helped us to pinpoint areas in our curriculum that needed to be updated and/or enhanced.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The Ph.D. Program office will continue to enhance and refine monitoring techniques of the students and the program. More online monitoring is planned through the BANNER system. By year's end, it is expected that all phases of the curriculum will be online.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
1. Revamping of the curriculum
2. Enhanced online monitoring of student progress

Challenges for Next Year
Our greatest challenge is to continue to enhance our online monitoring system of students and to deliver quality service to our constituents (applicants, students, faculty, alumni) in a year of severe financial cutbacks.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
In our original assessment, grades of individual courses were monitored. Student overall performance is now used, giving a broader scope of reference.

University-wide Committee Participation
The Ph.D. Program office advises the Ph.D.Fellows student association, a group of all Ph.D. students in the Robinson College of Business. This organization allows students to have the opportunity to not only socialize, but to have speakers discuss topics of common interest.

Publications and Presentations
The Ph.D. Program office and the academic units will work on keeping a more comprehensive record of student scholarly publications and conference presentations.

Academic Teaching Activities
Students will continue to be required to take BA 9200, the teaching preparation course. Students who teach will continue to have departmental oversight. Evaluations from student evaluations will be used, along with other criteria, to critique graduate teaching assistant performance and to give constructive criticism.

International Activities
The Ph.D. Program is actively working with the Institute of International Business to develop a minor in international business for Ph.D. students. There are currently active standing agreements with Universite Dauphine in Paris, France (visiting exchange with the Department of Finance and dual degree with the Department of Computer Information Systems). Talks have been initiated concerning a joint program between the Department of Computer Information Systems and the University of Oulu.

Contributions to Student Retention
The Ph.D. Program office works proactively to identify students at risk. This is done not only through the monitoring of grades, but by
having an open-door policy that encourages students to come forward with concerns. Students experiencing difficulties are often encouraged to discuss issues with faculty or with the campus counseling center.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose over-arching 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.

### Goals

**G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development**  
School counselors are committed to their students and to their learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom guidance settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

**G 2: Professional Practice/Experience**  
School counselors reflect on their practice and learn from that experience.

**G 3: Learning Communities**  
School counselors are participating members of learning communities. This participation allows them to share their expertise and to gain valuable ideas from other practicing school counselors.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
School counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills that contribute to P-12 student learning and development.  
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev (G: 1) (M: 2)**  
In order to assist all P-12 students in school success, school counselors must monitor, manage, and evaluate student learning and development. Student learning and development as assisted by school counselors takes place through school counselors’ leadership in individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance activities, parent and teacher consultation, using community resources, and advocating for students.  
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 3: Professional Reflection and Learning (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)**  
School counselors reflect continually on their professional practice. This reflection allows them to learn from their experiences, including those practices that are effective and those that need to be revised.  
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 4: Participates in Learning Communities (G: 3) (M: 4)**  
School counselors participate in learning communities, including classroom groups, mentoring relationships, feeder school groups, and other appropriate learning groups. In this way, school counselors can share their expertise with others, as well as learn from other school counselors.  
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills (O: 1)**  
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 learning and development. Students must also complete a tape critique form that provides the purpose of the session, a summary of the session, their strengths and what they learned from the experience.  
Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)
**Target for O1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills**

At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a grade of B or better.

**M 2: Action Research Project (O: 2)**

Students will implement a selected accountability protocol following the ASCA National Model. Students will be required to plan and implement an intervention, evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using the ASCA Guidance Curriculum Results Report template, complete the Guidance Curriculum Results Report, and evaluate the original plan. This last evaluation should include and explain the rationale for the lesson plan and describe the 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.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev**

At least 90% of the students will earn a grade of B or better.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a grade of B or better.

**M 3: Supervision Session Summary Form (O: 3)**

After completing a supervision session with another school counselor, students must complete a Session Summary Form that includes information about the supervisee, a session analysis, a description of the supervisor's (student) strengths and weaknesses, and plans for the next session.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Professional Reflection and Learning**

At least 90% of the students will submit 6 complete, acceptable Session Summary Forms.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students submitted 6 complete, acceptable Session Summary Form.

**M 4: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes (O: 3, 4)**

Students in CPS 8480 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 model.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Professional Reflection and Learning**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the students played the required number of tapes and provided appropriate feedback to other students.

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

**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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev
- Measure: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | Outcome/Objective: Participates in Learning Communities
- Measure: Supervision Session Summary Form | Outcome/Objective: Professional Reflection and Learning

**Implementation Description:** The School Counseling faculty will monitor the outcomes/objectives.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** School Counseling Faculty

**Additional Resources:** At least one additional school counseling faculty member.

**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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The School Counseling faculty will continue to meet to assess the program of study so that it continues to help students identify and focus on their educational needs and the needs of the school where they work.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Along with the M. Ed. program, the focus has been on becoming more consistent with the American School Counseling Association’s (ASCA) National Model, especially with regard to using data to inform learning. The higher standards for the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited M. Ed. program have also influenced the Ed. S. program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

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. We are using the data to continue to bring the Ed. S. program more in line with the ASCA National Model.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

No operational changes have been made. The students met the standards set by the program; therefore, changes were not needed.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

All standards were met by the students this year. No operational improvements are called for at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

All the standards set for the program were met. There are some changes that can be made to help students complete graduation requirements in a timely manner. We have an orientation (attendance optional) for the Ed. S. programs. We will begin using a form that states that the student attended/did not attend the orientation. If they did not attend, we will ask them to state that they read and understood the handbook. In this way, we can underscore the importance of being familiar with administrative graduation requirements.
## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Knowledge of Foundations of School Counseling (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the foundations of school counseling including history and philosophy, professional identity, roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession on a comprehensive test in CPS 6020/6030.

Relevant Associations: The Council for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

### SLO 2: Demonstrates Skills in Counseling and Guidance (G: 2) (M: 2)

During CPS 7661 and CPS 7681 (practicum and internship) students must demonstrate individual and small group counseling skills including structuring the session, establishing and maintaining open and honest communication, responding empathetically, using appropriate questioning techniques, reflecting content, allowing silence when appropriate, identifying and disclosing goals of misbehavior, offering alternatives, summarizing and using appropriate closure techniques. In addition, interns must demonstrate their effective use of peer facilitation and their ability to deal with specific issues such as abuse, eating disorders, drug abuse, etc.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### SLO 3: Demonstrates Counseling Skills (G: 2) (M: 3)

Students demonstrate skills learned during CPS 6410 including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions, and closure.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)

Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students must observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. The experience will be described in a paper.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### SLO 5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Leadership (G: 3) (M: 5)

Interns must demonstrate their ability to respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests. Interns must be sensitive to school, community and cultural norms, understand the counselor’s role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, and effectively use knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social, and career development programs that meet the needs of diverse populations.
### Relevant Associations:
Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)
In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and rationale for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations.

### SLO 7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research (G: 3, 5, 6) (M: 7)
Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their school and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement, access to classes, or other services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts.

### SLO 8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills (G: 6) (M: 8)
Students must demonstrate the following classroom guidance skills: defining session goals, structuring the group, using age appropriate materials, using a variety of activities, keeping the group on task, employing effective classroom management skills, pacing the lesson appropriately, and using appropriate summary/closure techniques.

### SLO 9: Knowledge of Consultation & Collaboration (G: 7) (M: 9)
Students must demonstrate their knowledge of consultation and collaboration, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families, teachers, and communities to empower them and build partnerships, and conducting programs to enhance students’ development needs.

### SLO 10: Demonstrates Consultation & Collab. Skills (G: 7) (M: 10)
Students must demonstrate the following consultation and collaboration skills: establishing rapport, structuring the interview, responding empathetically, reflecting content, providing encouragement/support, identifying mistaken goal of behavior, defining and focusing on problem areas, helping to develop a plan of action or treatment strategy, helping the consultee learn to advocate for self as appropriate, planning for follow-up session, and using appropriate closure techniques.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1)
CPS 6020/6030 provides an overview of the unique issues of school counseling, including history and philosophy, professional roles and credentials, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession. The comprehensive test covers all aspects of the course to assess student knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Foundations of School Counseling**
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the comprehensive test.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive test.

#### M 2: Site Supr. Eval of Indiv & Small Group Counseling (O: 2)
Site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate their intern’s skills in individual and small group counseling. Evaluation consists of case consultation, listening to tape recorded sessions and/or direct observation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Skills in Counseling and Guidance**
At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on 85% or more of the specific ratings for individual counseling. At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on 85% or more of the specific ratings for small group counseling.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on 85% or more of the specific ratings for individual counseling. 100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on 85% or more of the specific ratings for small group counseling.

#### M 3: Final Video Tape (O: 3)
Students are evaluated on their effective use of counseling skills via a final video tape role play in CPS 6410. This tape should reflect skills learned during the semester, including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions and closure.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)
**Target for O3: Demonstrates Counseling Skills**
At least 90% of the students will earn a score above the cut-off score (23 out of 38 points or 60%).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a score above the cut-off score.

**M 4: Multicultural Experience/Paper (O: 4)**
Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students should observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. Students will write a 4-5 page paper that summarizes knowledge gained from the field experience and from the readings.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity**
At least 90% of the students will earn 85% or better on the multicultural experience/paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of the students earned 85% or better on the multicultural experience/paper.

**M 5: Site Supr. Eval. of MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship (O: 5)**
Site supervisor’s for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate students on their ability to respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests; their sensitivity to school, community and cultural norms, their understanding of the counselor’s role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, their effective use of knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social and career development programs that meet the needs of the diverse population; as well as other aspects of multicultural awareness, advocacy, and leadership in the school setting.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship**
At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**M 6: Appraisal Case Study (O: 6)**
In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and the rational for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations. Case studies are evaluated based on the previously stated issues as well as on organization, written expression, appropriate use of citations and references and on integration of course material.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal**
At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the case study.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.

**M 7: Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) (O: 7)**
Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Students analyze the demographic data from their schools and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement or in access to classes and other activities and services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts. The grade is assigned based on the appropriateness of the plan, the type of analysis used, the outcome and the discussion of the findings.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research**
At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**M 8: Site Supr. Eval. of Classroom Guidance Skills (O: 8)**
The site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate the students on the following classroom guidance skills: session goals defined, the group is structured, age appropriate materials employed, a variety of activities used, group kept on task, effective classroom management skills, appropriate pacing, and appropriate summary closure techniques.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Target for O8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills**
At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for classroom guidance skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for classroom guidance skills.

**M 9: Consultation Quizzes (O: 9)**
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' development needs.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O9: Knowledge of Consultation & Collaboration**
At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on each quiz.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of the students earned 80% or better on quiz #1. 96% of the students earned 80% or better on quiz #2.

**M 10: Site Supr. Evaluation of Consultation Skills (O: 10)**
The site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate the students 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 develop a plan of action or treatment strategy and helps consultee learn to advocate for self as appropriate, plans for follow-up session, and uses appropriate closure techniques.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O10: Demonstrates Consultation & Collab. Skills**
At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for consultation and collaboration skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
96% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher for 85% or more of the specific ratings for consultation and collaboration skills.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty
- Additional Resources: Two additional faculty members

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The School Counseling faculty will continue to evaluate additions to the program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
The School Counseling faculty will continue to evaluate additions to the program.
From the formal and informal feedback we received from students, we determined that some extra programs are needed outside of class time (practicum boot camp, for example). Because the assessments indicate we are meeting the goals set, no major changes are being made in the program, except those needed to meet the new School Counseling Standards set by CACREP.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Although the students continue to meet the standards set by the program regarding the practicum/internship, several operational improvements have been made that the School Counseling faculty think will improve the practicum/internship experience. The practicum/internship orientation will be held earlier in the academic year so that placements can occur earlier. This is important so that students can meet with the on-site supervisor before the previous school year ends to make plans for the beginning of the next school year when the student will be placed at that school. Current on-site supervisors have stated that it is extremely important for the internship student to be at the school during pre-planning. In addition, this summer (2009) we implements a practicum "boot camp" to revisit the requirements for the practicum/internship and to discuss any concerns the students have. The application deadline was moved from January 15 to November 15. The earlier deadline will allow the School Counseling faculty to interview and select applicants for admission earlier so that we can be competitive with other universities.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The students met all of the assessment requirements set by the program. From informal evaluations, it was found that the students wanted their site placements earlier so that they could become familiar with their school site during the summer before their placement began. In this way they could more easily satisfy the requirements that are based on school data.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The School Counseling faculty advocated for earlier admission deadlines. We believe this will help improve the qualifications of the students admitted to the program. We also advocated for earlier site placements for the practicum/internship. We believe this will help us meet the new CACREP standards for school counseling.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The goal of the Masters/Ed.S. program in School Psychology is to train school psychologists to become certified for work in the schools. By successfully completing the courses, practica and internships in this program, the graduating school psychologists are prepared to continue to provide and evaluate effective school psychological services that include consultation, preventive intervention, counseling as well as data-based decision making and psycho-educational diagnosis targeted to students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members affiliated with public schools. In addition, graduates develop advanced knowledge and skills in using research methodology and statistics, in planning, implementing, and evaluating school-based evaluation research, in understanding current trends in the field of school psychology, in ethical issues relevant to the practice of psychology in educational settings and in using technology to facilitate practice in school settings.

**Goals**

**G 2: Understands School Psychology Practice**
Students will understand the foundations and practice of school psychology.

**G 1: Professionalism**
To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work in a diverse society. In addition, our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices.

**G 3: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice**
To ensure that our graduates are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology and that they can use research findings to properly conduct research, particularly in educational settings.

**G 4: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools**
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing intervention, consultation, and psychoeducational assessments.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.

Relevant Associations: NASP & 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

### SLO 2: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (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: NASP & NCATE

### SLO 3: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

### SLO 4: Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

### SLO 5: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Student will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

### SLO 6: Understands School Psychology, Practice, & Development (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Student will understand school psychology practice in multiple settings and adopt appropriate professional practices.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

### SLO 7: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.

Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE
### SLO 8: Effectively utilizes Information Technology. (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively.
Relevant Associations: NASP & 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

### SLO 9: Develops Cognitive and Academic Competencies (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic competencies in children.
Relevant Associations: NASP & 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

### SLO 10: Understand Socialization and Life Competencies (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand the development of socialization skills and Life Competencies in school-age children.
Relevant Associations: NASP & 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

### SLO 11: Understand diversity, development, & learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.
Relevant Associations: NASP & 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: 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, the site-based supervisors' rating and university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Understands School Organizations, 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 2008-2009**
- **Target:** Met
100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009**
- **Target:** Met
100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009**
- **Target:** Met
100% of students received a passing score for this objective.
### Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O6: Understands School Psychology, Practice, & Development

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O7: Effective at Consultation & 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O8: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O9: Develops Cognitive and Academic Competencies

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O10: Understand Socialization and Life Competencies

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### Target for O11: Understand diversities, development, & learning

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a passing score for this objective.

### M 2: Faculty STARS Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

Faculty rate the students of the School Psychology Survey at the end of the program. (STARS-related survey)

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O1: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate**

80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.
Target for **O2: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O3: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O5: Understands Research and Program Evaluation**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O6: Understands School Psychology, Practice, & Development**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O7: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O8: Effectively utilizes Information Technology.**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O9: Develops Cognitive and Academic Competences**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O10: Understand Socialization and Life Competencies**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

Target for **O11: Understand diversity, development, & learning**
80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating on each element of the STARS-related faculty survey

**Findings** 2008-2009 - **Target: Met**
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

**M 3: 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, the site-based supervisors’ rating, and the university-based supervisors’ rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student’s acquisition of required skills and competency in targeted areas.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
### Target for O1: Understands School Organizations, 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O3: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O6: Understands School Psychology, Practice, & Development

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O7: Effective at Consultation & 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O8: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O9: Develops Cognitive and Academic Competencies

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O10: Understand Socialization and Life Competencies

Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O11: Understand diversity, development, & learning
Students are required to achieve a passing score on all elements of the portfolio in order to progress in the program. The target is for 100% of students to pass all elements of the portfolio.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### M 4: Supervisor Ratings (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Practicum and Internship site-based supervisor's rate the students' skill and acquisition of school psychology knowledge and skills across the identified objectives of the EdS program.
Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

### Target for O1: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Practicum and Internship Supervisors.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O2: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O3: Promotes Home/School/Community Collaboration
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O5: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O6: Understands School Psychology, Practice, & Development
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O7: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

### Target for O8: Effectively utilizes Information Technology.
80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.
**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

**Target for O9: Develops Cognitive and Academic Competences**

80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

**Target for O10: Understand Socialization and Life Competencies**

80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

**Target for O11: Understand diversity, development, & learning**

80% of the students will obtain satisfactory or higher scores on each element of the program as rated by the Internship Supervisor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All students received a satisfactory or higher rating for this objective.

**M 5: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention**

Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children's mental health.

Source of Evidence: Efficiency

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We did not need to create action plans for next year since we met our goals and objectives. However, we will continue to assess the reliability and validity of our current measures and determine if additional measures are needed to accurately assess our goals and objectives.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have made several changes to our EdS program since last years report including adding a rubric to practicum, revising the scaling on the practicum supervisor rating form to be consistent with other scales, and discussed other alternatives for assessment measures.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are meeting our goals and objectives for the program. However, we want to continue to assess the knowledge and skills of our students and graduates utilizing valid and reliable assessment measures. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the current measures and identify new measures.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

Continued skill development of our students. Superior ratings from site supervisors (practicum and internship) of our graduating students. The continued improvement of our portfolio requirements and ratings for the EdS practicum and internship.

**Challenges for Next Year**

To continue to assess our strengths and weaknesses of the program and our students.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

N/A

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

We will continue to assess the reliability and validity of our assessment measures.
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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.

Goals
G 1: Goal 1: Professionalism
To prepare our graduates to ground his/her practice in basic science and to conduct legal and ethical practices in a pluralistic, diverse society.

G 2: Goal 2: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice
To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly research regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.

G 3: Goal 3: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at intervention, consultation, and assessment.

G 4: Goal 4: Area of Sub-Specialization
To ensure that our graduates, in addition of professional preparation as a school psychologist, has a subspecialty.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Follow the tenets of legal and ethical practice (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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

SLO 3: Understand the practice of psychology (G: 1) (M: 5)
To ensure that our graduates practices are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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
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 4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)
Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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

SLO 5: Use and conduct research (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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

SLO 6: Intervention (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing preventative and remedial intervention.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

SLO 7: Consultation (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing consultation.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

SLO 8: Psychoeducational Assessment (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing psychological assessment.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

SLO 9: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization (G: 4) (M: 5)
Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Diversity (G: 1) (M: 5)
To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work as professional school psychologists in a pluralistic, diverse society.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 5)
PhD students must complete a pre-dissertation research project as part of the program and prior to taking the comprehensive exam.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O5: Use and conduct research
100% of students must successfully complete their pre-dissertation research prior to taking comprehensive exams.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students successfully completed their pre-dissertation research prior to taking comprehensive exams.

M 2: Successful completion of dissertation research (O: 5)
A doctoral dissertation that represents independent scholarly research is required.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O5: Use and conduct research
100% of students must successfully complete their dissertation research prior to graduation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of students successfully completed their dissertation research prior to graduation.

M 3: Successful completion of comprehensive examination (O: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
A comprehensive examination that assesses knowledge of advanced principles of psychology, school psychology, ethics, and professional practice must be passed prior to graduation.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal and ethical practice
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

Target for O5: Use and conduct research
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

Target for O6: Intervention
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

Target for O7: Consultation
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment
80% of students will successfully complete the comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of students successfully completed comprehensive examinations.

M 5: Readiness for Entry into Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)
Our graduates are assessed evaluating all program goals during his/her pre-doctoral internship. Licensed site supervisors are asked to evaluate each student utilizing a 5 point likert scale. 5= Student demonstrates outstanding and/or advanced performance on this objective and competency. 4= Student demonstrates satisfactory performance on this objective and competency. 3= Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing. 2= Student's performance on this objective needs improvement; remediation plan may be required. 1= Student's performance on this objective and competency is unsatisfactory; remediation required.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Diversity
80% of our graduates are expected to receive a rating of a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of our students achieved a rating of 3 or higher in the area of diversity.

Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal and ethical practice
80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher in regards to following the tenets of legal and ethical practice.

Target for O3: Understand the practice of psychology
80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher in the area of understanding the practice of psychology.

Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology
80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).
### Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a 3 or higher in understanding the principles of psychology and school psychology.

### Target for O5: Use and conduct research

80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a 3 or higher in the area of using and conducting research.

### Target for O6: Intervention

80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher on developing, implementing and evaluating interventions.

### Target for O7: Consultation

80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher in the area of consultation.

### Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment

80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher in conducting psychoeducational assessments.

### Target for O9: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization

80% of our graduates are expected to receive a 3 (Student's performance on this objective and competency is developing).

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

100% of our students received a rating of 3 or higher in developing skills in one or more subspecialization.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We do not have any current action plans since we met all of our objectives.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our program has made several changes based on information from last year's assessment report. First, we have extended up and down rubrics to assess knowledge and skills for all goals and objectives at the pre-practicum and pre-doctoral internships. Second, we have conducted many program discussions on ways other than grades that can be used to evaluate our program goals and objectives that information has been incorporated and we will continue to focus on reliable and valid alternatives. Third, we have streamlined our program to address concerns of length but to maintain our goals and objectives of the program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are meeting and exceeding our goals and objectives for our program. I would like us to continue to look at alternatives to assess current goals and objectives. In addition, we have made program changes that we will be able to use this information in the future to look at the impact of these changes.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

Receiving APA program approval for 7 years. Implementing rubrics at the pre-practicum and pre-doctoral internship in 2009-2010. Implementing a standardized scale for assessing knowledge and skills for all goals and objectives for 2009-2010

**Challenges for Next Year**

Managing large amounts of data in a systematic way. Determining the reliable and valid measures for goals and objectives other than course grades.
Modifications in Intended Outcomes
N/A

Modifications in Measurement Methods
We will continue to modify measurement methods as we continue to collect data in an effort determine the most reliable and valid way to assess each goal and objective.

---
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Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Unknown (M: 2)
Unknown

O/O 2: Unknown (M: 9)
Unknown

O/O 3: Unknown (M: 10)
Unknown

O/O 4: Unknown (M: 3, 6)
Unknown

O/O 5: Unknown (M: 1)
Unknown

O/O 6: Unknown (M: 7, 8)
Unknown

O/O 7: Unknown (M: 9)
Unknown

O/O 8: Unknown (M: 3, 4)
Unknown

O/O 9: Can plan and implement science curriculum (M: 2, 3, 5, 9)
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 10: Unknown (M: 5)
Unknown

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Unknown (O: 5)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O5: Unknown
100 % of teacher candidates will attend and 90 % will successfully complete the safety certification workshop.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of 2 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 2: Unknown (O: 1, 9)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target for **O1**: Unknown
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

Target for **O9**: Can plan and implement science curriculum
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 3: Unknown (O: 4, 8, 9)
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for **O4**: Unknown
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

Target for **O8**: Unknown
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

Target for **O9**: Can plan and implement science curriculum
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 4: Unknown (O: 8)
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for **O8**: Unknown
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
100% of 2 students scored a 2 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 5: Unknown (O: 9, 10)
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for **O9**: Can plan and implement science curriculum
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘4’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
50% or 1 student scored a 5 on element rubric while the other 50% (1 student) scored a 4 on element rubric. Therefore, all students either met or exceeded expectations.

Target for **O10**: Unknown
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘4’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target:** Met
50% or 1 student scored a 5 on element rubric while the other 50% (1 student) scored a 4 on element rubric. Therefore, all students either met or exceeded expectations. Established by Geeta Verma on 4/30/2009

M 6: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (Nature of Science) (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.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Portfolio element: Curriculum Exploration/Analysis (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Unknown (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Unknown (O: 2, 7, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Can plan and implement science curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Unknown (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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 2008-2009 academic year.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: This activity is ongoing so there is no target date for full implementation. This is a college wide initiative.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: COE Dean's office

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: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: This action plan will be developed further by this date.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: All program faculty. 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). We need to meet as a group to further discuss and develop ideas for integrating diverse learning experiences for our students.
- Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
Having an ad-hoc committee to discuss and solve these issues at the dept. level.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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. This allows us to have dept. wide conversations about these two issues in all of our M.Ed. programs since the students in this program are in-service teachers.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
We are beginning to use livetext for data collection at two levels: data from portfolio assessment (summative) and data from individual program assessments (formative assessment) to track students' progress. Livetext will allow us to have a data warehouse to not only store data but also to be able to run different analysis using the data.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
This year’s finding further establishes the need to have the data warehouse (LIVETEXT). We need to find a person to manage it (for various programs) so that one person has an overall understanding of the data collection process.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Our goal is to get all of the courses in the program (they house the program assessments) transferred to livetext so that data gathering becoming flawless and efficient.
**Mission / Purpose**

This program should be listed as Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University M.Ed. Online Program in Science Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

**Goals**

**G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement**

The goal of the MEd Online Science Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in the natural sciences and pedagogical practices which includes inquiry, working with diverse student populations, and literacy.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Unknown (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Unknown

**SLO 2: Unknown (M: 2)**

Unknown

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Unknown (M: 3)**

Unknown

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Unknown (O: 1)**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Unknown**

80% of the students will score 20 out of 25 points in order to achieve this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Fall 2009 data show that 40% of the students exceeded the expectation of scoring 80% on the Cultural Awareness project on the first submission and 50% achieved the targeted expectation. A total of 90% of the students met or exceeded the target.

**M 2: Unknown (O: 2)**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

80 percent of the students will score a minimum of 24/30 in order to achieve this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data show that 50% of the students exceeded the target expectation and 50% met the target expectation.

**M 3: Unknown (O: 3)**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Unknown**

80% of the students will score 12/15 in order to meet this target.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Data show that 90% of the students exceeded the target of scoring 80% on the first submission of their Curriculum Exploration projects.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Faculty will develop a common approach to improving students’ understanding of planning inquiry lessons and this type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDSC 8400 Strategies of Instruction in Science. Faculty will continue to include in their courses content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues. In addition, faculty will make the Cultural Awareness Project a course requirement for the Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction, EDSC 7550. Curriculum theories and principles will be incorporated in all courses but will be the major focus of EDSC 8600, Science Curriculum Theory, where students will submit the Curriculum Exploration project as a course assignment.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is a new degree report, and there was no report for last year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In order to achieve the expected targets, a good percentage of the students had to resubmit the required documents. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, strategies for planning inquiry lessons, and content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses that are offered in the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Science Education--TEEMS MAT
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MAT science program is to prepare high quality urban science teachers who understand and implement reform based practices.

Goals
G 1: Can teach using culturally relevant pedagogy
To prepare science teachers who can implement culturally relevant pedagogy

G 2: Uses reform science methods
To prepare reform minded teachers (e.g., inquiry & problem-based learning, socio-scientific issues)

G 3: Uses technology competently
To prepare technologically competent teachers to meet demands of 21st century

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 3) (M: 1)
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students exhibit knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Motivates and manages students for learning (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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: School and Community Involvement (G: 1) (M: 6)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate purposeful and effective relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge (G: 2) (M: 7)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate an 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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

**SLO 8: Practices professional reflection (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 8)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate continuous evaluation of the effects her/his choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

**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

**SLO 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 1, 2) (M: 9)**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understanding and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (G: 1, 2) (M: 10)
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understandings of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Institutional Priority Associations
3 Contribute to the greater community good
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

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 4: Can effectively plan for instruction (G: 2) (M: 4)
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students preservice teachers plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals.

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

O/O 5: Understands student development re: learning (G: 1, 2) (M: 5)
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

Institutional Priority Associations
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: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating (O: 1)
Supervisors' internship (practicum) evaluations, course assignment, student interviews and overall portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS/PAARS database for Standard 6.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. 100% of students passed the technology component of the online program portfolio. However, faculty reported that 75% of the responses were at or above the target in the area of effective communication and in the use of communication strategies to promote higher level learning in the field.

M 2: Uses assessment for learning (O: 2)
Portfolio: Includes artifacts and mentor/supervisor evaluations describing different types of assessment and the appropriate use of them in the classroom
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
68% of students were rated proficient by faculty supervisors. 100% passed the portfolio measure. This would indicate that students can provide several examples of assessment, but are not yet well practiced in the field.

**M 3: Motivation and Management of Students (O: 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.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Motivates and manages 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

100% demonstrated proficiency on the portfolio requirement. 83% demonstrated proficiency in the classroom. Therefore, students were able to discuss and provide artifacts showing their understandings and abilities to manage and motivate students. However, GSU supervisors did not rank their performance in the field as highly.

**M 4: Instructional Planning (O: 4)**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

100% of candidates passed the portfolio component while 81% of candidates demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. Therefore, the candidates were able to show readiness on paper, however performance in the field was somewhat inconsistent.

**M 5: Student Learning and Development (O: 5)**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 81% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**M 6: School and Community Involvement (O: 6)**

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 90% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**M 7: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (O: 7)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O7: Demonstrates pedagogical content 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 94% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Reflective Practice (O: 8)**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 85% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Instructional Variety (O: 9)**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O9: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 81% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Effectively teaches diverse learners (O: 10)**

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O10: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 83% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Instructional Planning  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are asking students to use appropriate technology in their practicum experiences and in their science teaching methods presentations. We are having our students access information and use technology in a variety of ways including online resources and software.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based upon last year’s and this year’s assessments, our science education unit as decided that the fall practicum expansion from 6 weeks to 8 weeks is still too brief. We have recommended expanding the practicum to 12 weeks. This will provide for additional practice in the classroom and more experiences to be able to demonstrate proficiencies in several areas.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are progressing well in our development of future science teachers, however our science ed unit in MSIT will need to continue to find ways to link technology and applications of technology into our methods courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We attempted to have students use iPod technology last year. However, our scores remain static in terms of this assessment (no improvement, no loss).

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings are somewhat useful as we are examining different ways to have our students implement technology and to demonstrate these abilities.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We are asking students to use appropriate technology in their practicum experiences and in their science teaching methods presentations. We are having our students access information and use technology in a variety of ways including online resources and software. We anticipate that more students will accomplish mastery of demonstrating the appropriate use of technology in the classroom.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Social Foundations MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Social Foundations of Education is a broadly conceived field of educational study that derives its character from a number of academic disciplines and the interdisciplinary studies. At Georgia State University, the disciplines involved in social foundations inquiry are history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, and political science; the interdisciplinary field is cultural studies. The purpose of social foundations study is to bring the intellectual resources derived from these areas to bear in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives of educational theory, policy, and practices, both inside of and outside of schools.

Goals
G 1: Designs and Conducts Research
The student demonstrates the ability to design a major research study, appropriate at the Masters level.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: The student will complete a thesis or project (G: 1) (M: 1)
The student has completed a thesis or project advancing an original point of view as a result of Social Foundations research.

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Masters Scoring Activity (O: 1)
A faculty advisor and two committee members are responsible for directing the master's thesis research or master's projects. During the last academic term of coursework, each student will be required to complete an oral examination. The candidate's committee will administer the oral examination, which is not to exceed two hours. The committee will complete the scoring rubric after the oral exam (see Document Repository).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: The student will complete a thesis or project
95% of MS Social Foundations students will meet or exceed expectations as outlined in the scoring rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
3 students exceeded the measure.

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

MS Thesis and Project
The program faculty will continue to monitor the named outcome and assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Masters Scoring Activity | Outcome/Objective: The student will complete a thesis or project

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MS Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

MS thesis and project options
Monitor the quality of students who select one of two capstone options.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement? We will have a clearer data bank for graduates who chose the project versus the thesis option.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year? Added a faculty coordinator for the MS program to help with advising students, admissions, teaching and curriculum, and assessing this graduate degree offering.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The SF major continues to be a strong attraction to high-achieving students who want to study theory as related to practice. Recent application packets have shown high GRE/GPA scores, prior university training in-field, and strong references from former professors, among other indicators of academic quality.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Social Studies Education MEd
As of 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Student Learning/Development (M: 1)
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

SLO 2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 2)
The educator thinks systematically about her/his practice and learns from professional experience.

SLO 3: Participates in professional learning communities (M: 3)
The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

SLO 4: Committed to student learning and development (M: 4)
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

SLO 5: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 5)
The educator is an expert in her/his field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning/development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Learning and Development (Standard 3) (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for learning and development (Standard 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Student Learning/Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Reflection (Standard 4) (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for reflection (Standard 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Reflects on &amp; learns from professional experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for professional learning communities (Standard 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Participates in professional learning communities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Commitment to S. Lrng. &amp; Dev. (Standard 1) (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for commitment to student learning and development (Standard 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Committed to student learning and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Expertise to learning and development (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for applying expertise to student learning and development (Standard 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will be looking into various recruitment options available to us, including the possibility of collapsing all of our masters degrees into one program with differing areas of specialty.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our portfolio assessment is fully aligned with the Advanced level of the GA framework for teaching. We have updated the program of study to better reflect student needs and faculty resources.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have learned that the program changes we implemented are, thus far, working well for students. We are looking towards significantly increasing enrollment at this point in time.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2008-2009 Social Studies Education--TEEMS MAT

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop broad content knowledge that is transformed given the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.

**G 2: Purpose/History of Social Studies**
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

**G 3: Diverse Learning Environments**
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop the ability to create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with special needs.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Unknown (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Content and Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Unknown (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Knowledge of Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Unknown (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Learning Environments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

**M 6: Unknown (O: 6)**

**Unknown**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: Professionalism**

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 2008-2009 - 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.

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

**Maintain Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue 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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue 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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to continue to promote 100% competency. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Our department will continue to emphasize each standard in the core social studies classes to better enhance students' understanding of each standard.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Our department increased the target percentage for completers to 85% based on previous data. We also added a new elective course to enhance students' understanding of lesson planning and we reduced the number of content credit hours so students could fit the new social studies elective course into their program of study.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Even though we were very successful and exceeded our 85% target with a 100% of our candidates demonstrating at or above the proficient level for all standards, our department will continue to focus on topics and assignments in our core social studies classes that will enhance our students' understanding of each standard.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Social Work BSW
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Practitioners**
Students will learn the generalist skills and knowledge to assume an entry level professional social work position

**G 2: Critical Thinkers**
Students will learn skills to assess information and data to use in social work practice

**G 3: Communication**
Students will be able to effectively communicate with clients, peers, and other constituencies

**G 4: ValuesEthics**
Students will be able to identify professional and personal values and ethics, and make application to clients, communities, and organizations

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Written Communication: Soc Work (M: 1, 12, 19)**
Students demonstrate written communication skills through research and position papers in subject specific to social work including areas that impact vulnerable populations

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

Students demonstrate oral communication skills specific to social work practice

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
2 Oral Communication

**O/O 3: Collaboration: Case Planning (M: 3, 13, 14)**
Students demonstrate collaboration skills through case planning with clients, including gathering client information and constructing a plan of action

**O/O 4: Collaboration: Social Agencies (M: 8, 15, 16)**
Students demonstrate collaboration skills in working with social agencies to benefit clients

**O/O 5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics (M: 2, 17, 18)**
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

**O/O 6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related (M: 4, 9, 19, 20)**
Students demonstrate understanding of contemporary issues through the integration of the larger social environment on individuals, families and communities

**O/O 7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative (M: 5, 21, 22)**
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

**O/O 8: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice (M: 6, 23, 24)**
Students demonstrate research skills through translating research into appropriate practice approaches with social work clients.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Outcome Survey Q 1 (O: 1)**
Confidence to apply critical thinking skills within the context of professional social work practice
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Written Communication: Soc Work**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
83% identified themselves as confident or very confident

**M 2: Outcome Survey Q2 (O: 5)**
Confidence in understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
95% report being confident or very confident

**M 3: Outcome Survey Q6 (O: 3)**
Confidence to apply the knowledge and skills of a generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning**
95% report being confident or very confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
73% report being confident or very confident. An additional 27 report being somewhat confident

**M 4: Outcome Survey Q7 (O: 6)**
Q7Theory
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
70% report being very confident or confident

**M 5: Outcome Survey Q8 (O: 7)**
Confident to analyze, formulate, and influence social policies.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
83% are very confident or confident. Additional 30% are somewhat confident.

**M 6: Outcome Survey Q9 (O: 8)**
Confident to evaluate research studies, apply findings to practice, and evaluate one's own practice interventions.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O8: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
73% report being very confident or confident. An additional 27% report being somewhat confident.

**M 7: Outcome Survey Q10 (O: 2)**
Confident to use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice</th>
<th>95% = very confident or confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>94% reported that they were very confident or confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Outcome Survey Q12 (O: 4)**
Confident to function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and seek necessary organizational change.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies**
95% = very confident or confident

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Partially Met**
76% were very confident or confident. 23% were somewhat confident

**M 9: TheoryLateLife (O: 6)**
SW 3340 paper on Life Course Development:
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**
80% receive a B or higher

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
82% received B or higher

**M 10: ComTape (O: 2)**
SW 3610 Final tape in Communication course
Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice**
80% receive B or higher

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
93% received B or higher

**M 11: Field Com (O: 2)**
Sec5 – questions on communication (Q1 – 5) SW4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice**
90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
98% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship

**M 12: FieldWrite (O: 1)**
Sec5 – questions on communications (Q6) SW4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Written Communication: Soc Work**
90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
97% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship

**M 13: CasePlan (O: 3)**
SW 3720 Paper on client case plan
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning**
80% receive a B or higher

**Findings 2008-2009** - Target: **Met**
90% received a B or higher

**M 14: FieldPlan (O: 3)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sec5 – questions on case planning (Q8-12)</strong></th>
<th>SW4340 Final Field Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning</strong></td>
<td>90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>90% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 15: SocAgency (O: 4)** | SW 4280 Paper on Community resource management |
| Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| **Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies** | 80% receive a B or higher |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met** | 87% received a B or higher |

| **M 16: FieldAgency (O: 4)** | Sec1 – questions on Community agencies (4-7) |
| Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation |
| **Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies** | 90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met** | 96% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship |

| **M 17: PaperValues (O: 5)** | SW 3320 Paper includes values/ ethics in practice |
| Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| **Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics** | 80% receive a B or higher |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met** | 100% received a B or better |

| **M 18: FieldValues (O: 5)** | Sec3 – questions on ethics (1 – 8) |
| Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation |
| **Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics** | 90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met** | 93% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship |

| **M 19: TheoryEarlyLife (O: 1, 6)** | SW 3330 Final Paper on early life |
| Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |
| **Target for O1: Written Communication: Soc Work** | 80% receive a B or higher |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met** | 52% received a B or higher |

| **Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related** | 80% receive a B or higher |
| **Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met** | 51% received a B or higher |

| **M 20: FieldTheory (O: 6)** | Sec4 – questions (1 – 5 A + B) |
| Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation |
### Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

#### Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related
90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 21: Policy Paper (O: 7)
SW 3930 Paper on legislation
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

#### Target for O7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative
80% receive a B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82% received B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 22: Field Policy (O: 7)
Sec 4 – policy, questions (7 A +B) SW 4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

#### Target for O7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative
90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 23: Research Final (O: 8)
SW 3020 Final Exam on research interpretation
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O8: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice
80% receive a B or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 24: Field Research (O: 8)
Sec Section 4 – research, questions (6 A +B) SW 4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

#### Target for O8: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice
90% rated by agency supervisor as having consistent behavior on this objective during the internship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84% were rated as having consistent behavior during the internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### CTW
The School has exceeded the minimum number of courses required for CTW. Beginning in Fall, we have 3 courses that students will complete: two semesters of a human behavior theory course and one semester of a social welfare policy courses. We exceeded the minimum number to provide additional opportunities for our students to work on critical thinking skills.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Outcome Survey Q 1
  - Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Soc Work
- **Implementation Description:** Begins in Fall 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

#### Field Research
Additional content on research and evidence based practice will be included in the field seminars that accompany the internships to assist students to integrate this content in their placement sites.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: FieldResearch | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice

**Generalist Practice**
Next academic year, 2009-10, the School is planning to review the entire undergraduate curriculum and change to a competency based approach. This new structure will help students identify the particular competencies needed for entry level BSW practice, and assist faculty with sequencing the values, skills, and knowledge that students need at various points in their educational careers.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Outcome Survey Q6 | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration: Case Planning

  Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

**Survey Theory**
Part of the CTW courses in our School are the theory-related courses (2 semesters). Students will have the opportunity to work more closely on the application of theory to practice situations.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Outcome Survey Q7 | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related

  Projected Completion Date: 07/2009

**Theory**
This assignment will be included in the first semester CTW course. Problems in student performance were a combination of understanding content, as well as being able to organize content in a meaningful way within the paper. Starting next academic year, students will have the opportunity to rewrite the paper, as well as turn in drafts prior to a final version.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

**Theory Early Life**
This course is the first CTW offering for students within the major. Additional opportunities to submit paper drafts and rewrite the assignment will be included. In addition, writing consultants will be used in all sections to provide additional one-on-one consultation for student support with their papers.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Theory Early Life | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication: Soc Work

**Theory Early Life**
This course is the first CTW offering for students within the major. Additional opportunities to submit paper drafts and rewrite the assignment will be included. In addition, writing consultants will be used in all sections to provide additional one-on-one consultation for student support with their papers.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

**Theory Field**
The range in performance evaluations by section ranged from 73% - 88%. This area was the lowest ratings across all areas of the internship evaluations. To increase ability to use theory to guide practice, additional content on theory will be added to the field seminar course which runs concurrently with the internship. These changes will include additional overview of theoretical content, and practice on integration of theory with cases within presentations and written assignments.

  Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Field Theory | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related

  Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
**Goals**

**G 1: Practitioners**
Students will learn the advanced skills and knowledge in community partnerships to assume leadership roles within human services.

**G 2: Critical Thinkers**
Students will demonstrate skills to critically evaluate and integrate theory into practice.

**G 3: Communication**
Students will be able to effectively communicate with clients, peers, and other constituencies.

**G 4: Ethics**
Students will be able to practice using the professional standards within social work, and distinguish between professional, cultural, and personal values in practice.

**G 5: SW 8300 Papers**
Six papers on leadership that students write on various aspects of leadership in social welfare settings.

**G 6: Survey Technology**
Confidence in applying information technology to practice.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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.

**O/O 2: Community & Organizational Communications (M: 5, 6, 7, 8)**
Students demonstrate professional written and oral modes of interaction and relationship between individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.

**O/O 3: Community Assessment & Resource Development (M: 9, 10, 11, 12)**
Students demonstrate the ability to use theoretical and empirical content to determine challenges and assets within community settings.

**O/O 4: Community & Organizational Development (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)**
Students demonstrate the ability to formulate, maintain, and strengthen relationships and partnerships that build healthy communities.

**O/O 5: Leadership & Management (M: 17, 18, 19, 20)**
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.

**O/O 6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology (M: 21, 22, 23, 24)**
Students demonstrate the ability to apply evaluative measures, technological processes, and the management of information to understand and facilitate health communities.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Outcome Survey Q1 (O: 1)**
Critical thinking skills
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
88% identified themselves as confident or very confident

**M 2: Outcome Survey Q2 (O: 1)**
Understand values and ethics
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% identified themselves as confident or very confident
### M 3: SW 8100 Proposal (O: 1)
Final proposal for capstone student integrative project

**Source of Evidence:** Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**
90% receive B grade or higher

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher on assignment

### M 4: SW 8900 Critical Thinking Eval (O: 1)
Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**
90% are evaluated as excellent on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
98% were evaluated as excellent on this item

### M 5: Outcome Survey Q3 (O: 2)
Ability to communicate with diverse populations

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O2: Community & Organizational Communications**
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% reported being confident on this item

### M 6: Outcome Survey Q4 (O: 2)
Confidence in using differential communication strategies

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O2: Community & Organizational Communications**
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
88% identified themselves as confident or very confident

### M 7: SW 8800 Presentation (O: 2)
Student group presentation on their community project with a community partner

**Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Community & Organizational Communications**
90% receive B grade or higher

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% received a B or higher

### M 8: SW 8900 Communications Eval (O: 2)
Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Community & Organizational Communications**
90% are evaluated as excellent on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
95% are evaluated as excellent on this item

### M 9: Outcome Survey Q5 (O: 3)
Confidence with facilitating community partnerships

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O3: Community Assessment & Resource Development**
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**
81% identified themselves as confident or very confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 10: Outcome Survey Q6 (O: 3)</strong></th>
<th>Confidence assess for resource development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community Assessment &amp; Resource Development</strong></td>
<td>95% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>75% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 11: SW 7100 Com Assess Paper (O: 3)</strong></th>
<th>Paper in Foundations course on assessment of communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community Assessment &amp; Resource Development</strong></td>
<td>90% receive B grade or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>92% received B or higher on this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 12: SW 8900 Assessment Eval (O: 3)</strong></th>
<th>Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Community Assessment &amp; Resource Development</strong></td>
<td>95% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>92% are evaluated as excellent on this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 13: Outcome Survey Q7 (O: 4)</strong></th>
<th>Confidence in influencing organizational and community change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Community &amp; Organizational Development</strong></td>
<td>95% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>75% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 14: Outcome Survey Q8 (O: 4)</strong></th>
<th>Confidence in influencing policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Community &amp; Organizational Development</strong></td>
<td>95% report being confident or very confident on this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>53% report being confident on this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 15: SW 8100 Proposal (O: 4)</strong></th>
<th>Proposal for community project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Community &amp; Organizational Development</strong></td>
<td>90% receive B grade or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
<td>100% received a B or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 16: SW 8900 Development Eval (O: 4)</strong></th>
<th>Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Community &amp; Organizational Development</strong></td>
<td>90% are evaluated as excellent on this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% evaluated as excellent on this item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 17: Outcome Survey Q9 (O: 5)**  
Confidence in leadership and management skills  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
**Target for O5: Leadership & Management**  
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**  
88% report being confident or very confident on this item

**M 18: Outcome Survey Q14 (O: 5)**  
Confidence to be an effective SW upon graduation  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
**Target for O5: Leadership & Management**  
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**  
82% report being confident or very confident on this item

**M 19: SW 8900 Leadership Eval (O: 5)**  
Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  
**Target for O5: Leadership & Management**  
90% are evaluated as excellent on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**  
95% are evaluated as excellent on this item

**M 20: SW 8300 Papers (O: 5)**  
Six papers on various aspects of management that constitute the major assignments for the course  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric  
**Target for O5: Leadership & Management**  
90% receive B grade or higher

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**  
100% received a B or higher

**M 21: Outcome Survey Q11 (O: 6)**  
Confidence to apply technology to community practice  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**  
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**  
43% report being confident or very confident on this item

**M 22: Outcome Survey Q12 (O: 6)**  
Confidence on research skills  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  
**Target for O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**  
95% report being confident or very confident on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**  
82% report being confident or very confident on this item

**M 23: SW 8200 Research Presentation (O: 6)**  
Students provide a presentation of a research assignment that has been completed in conjunction with their internship site  
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target for **O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**

90% receive B grade or higher

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

92% received a B or better

**M 24: SW 8900 Leadership Eval (O: 6)**

Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for **O6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology**

90% are evaluated as excellent on this item

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

95% were evaluated as excellent on this item

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

**Survey Assessment**

This item was rated low compared to the target, and had 6% reporting minimal confidence. The MSW program committee will review ways to enhance this content within the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Outcome Survey Q6 | **Outcome/Objective:** Community Assessment & Resource Development

**Survey Confidence**

In leadership and management class, include additional time to discuss leadership outcome with graduating students

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Outcome Survey Q14 | **Outcome/Objective:** Leadership & Management

**Survey Facilitation**

Provide an additional opportunity with the field internship seminar to discuss learning on this skill.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Outcome Survey Q5 | **Outcome/Objective:** Community Assessment & Resource Development

**Survey Influence**

Have MSW program committee review this item and determine a method to increase students’ learning in second year field seminar course

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Outcome Survey Q7 | **Outcome/Objective:** Community & Organizational Development

**Survey Policy**

Student complete the policy course during the first year of the graduate program. Clearly, they are stating that they need additional opportunities to develop this skill during the second year, and integrating the content. The MSW program committee will review ways to “boost” this content during the second year of the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Outcome Survey Q8 | **Outcome/Objective:** Community & Organizational Development

**Survey Research**

The School sponsors monthly brown bag sessions for students, which have traditionally been focused on practice outcomes. Next year, some of the topics will involve evidence based practice approaches, and include more content on research

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Survey Technology
This course is a candidate to be restructured as a hybrid course (50% online). The advantage to this structure is that students can self pace and go through content in a slower pace, if the content seems to difficult. The School has tried that approach with other content areas, and has achieved good success.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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Goals

G 2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems
Students develop the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems. Students analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

G 1: Acquisition of Knowledge
Students articulate key sociological concepts and theories and utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

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
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

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems (G: 2)
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
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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SOCI 1101 and SOCI 1160 embedded exam questions (O: 1)**

SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions 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. The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 974 students from 11 sections of 1101 (408 students), and 12 sections of 1160 (566 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 91% of students in 1101 and 90% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 95% of students in 1101 and 92% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues," 75% of students in 1101 and 94% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly. Edit Finding Add Action Plan Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) 1. 2007-2008 Help

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

---
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**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. Established in Cycle: 2007-2008 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Help

**Goals**

**G 1: Acquisition of knowledge**

Students study and learn to clearly articulate key sociological concepts and theories.

**G 2: Application of knowledge**

Students apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.

**G 3: Utilization of Data Sources**

Students utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings analytically.

**G 4: Analysis of Social Problems**

Students will apply their skills to develop an analysis of contemporary social problems.

**G 5: Communication skills**

Through their work in sociology, students gain the skills necessary to clearly communicate their understanding, insights, and analyses verbally and in writing.

**G 6: Critical Thinking Skills**

Students demonstrate their abilities to synthesize data, data analysis, and theoretical arguments into cogent and insightful interpretive writing (or problem solving).

**G 7: Acquisition of Knowledge**

Students study and learn to clearly articulate key sociological concepts and theories.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: data collection and data analysis (G: 1, 2, 3) (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  
6. Quantitative Skills  
7. Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
SLO 3: Analysis of Social Problems (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 1, 2, 4)

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 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

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: Communication Skills (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)

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
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Acquisition of Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)

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

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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 5: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 6) (M: 1, 2, 3)

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
4 Critical Thinking

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: Sociological Theory (SOCI 3030) Final Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
This measure is derived from professors' evaluations of students' final exams. 127 students in three sections were evaluated. Professors judged 33% of their exams to be excellent (a score of 4); 18% to be very good (a score of 3); 4% to be good (a score of 2), and 17% to be poor (a score of 1). The median score is 3, which is our target goal.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
<th>Target is a median score of 3. Target met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3. Target was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Communication Skills</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3. Target was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3. Target was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 2: SOCI 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
Assessment is based on professors' evaluations of: students' course papers (in which they develop research proposals) and/or final exams. Students' work is assessed on each outcome/objective measure. 22 students were evaluated on their course papers, with a median score of 3 (very good) in acquisition of knowledge; analysis of social problems; communication; and critical thinking. 59 students were evaluated on their final examination performance, with a median score of 3 (very good) in acquisition of knowledge; analysis of social problems; communication; and critical thinking.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
<th>Target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Communication Skills</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>Target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance (O: 1, 2, 5)
Professors' evaluations of students' acquisition of knowledge, application of concepts, and critical thinking skills in Statistics courses. Professors evaluate students on a 4-point scale. The median score for all students evaluated (141) was 3.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
<th>The target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: data collection and data analysis</td>
<td>The target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>The target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 4: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam (O: 1, 3)
This measure is based on professors' evaluations of students' final exams, on a 4-point scale. Among 85 students assessed (2 sections) the median score was 3.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
<th>The target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</td>
<td>The target is a median score of 3 (very good). Target was met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We believe we are achieving excellent results, and will continue with our usual diligence and determination to do so.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

None, as we are satisfied with the results of our learning outcomes.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

These results mean we are achieving satisfactory results in our program. We always strive to incorporate innovative teaching strategies to encourage critical thinking and application of sociologically theoretical and methodological skills, so of course we will continue with these goals.

---
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#### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of Sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The broad knowledge of Sociology comes through coursework in a variety of substantive areas, as well as through training in research methodologies, statistics, and theory. The goals of the Department are to provide a general intellectual foundation that supports the student’s analytical understanding of social life, a sound methodological background that prepares the student for social research and policy evaluation, and a rich and specialized body of knowledge that equips the student for the practice of Sociology in both the public and private sectors.

#### Goals

**G 1: Analytical Skills**

Students are expected to master appropriate analytical skills.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**

Students are expected to possess appropriate critical thinking skills.

**G 3: Communication Skills**

Students are expected to evidence appropriate written communication skills.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**

Students are expected to appropriately use sociological concepts, theories, information, and data sources.

**G 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**

Students are required to possess the ability to appropriately analyze pressing social problems.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.

**SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**

The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.

**SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.

**SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**

The student is able to analyze and interpret data.
SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.

SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1)
The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.

SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1)
The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.

SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1)
The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.

SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1)
The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Masters Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)
The student's original Masters Thesis and Thesis Defense are used for assessment by the Thesis Chair. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Data Collection
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either "very good" or "excellent" by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being "excellent" by the Thesis chair.

Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either "very good" or "excellent" by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being "excellent" by the Thesis chair.

Target for O3: Research Reports
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either "very good" or "excellent" by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being "excellent" by the Thesis chair.

Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either "very good" or "excellent" by the Thesis chair. 33.3% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being "excellent" by the Thesis chair.

Target for O5: Data Analysis
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either "very good" or "excellent" by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being "excellent" by the Thesis chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O6: New Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 33.3% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Writing Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O9: Concepts and Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Facts and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O12: Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 33.3% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O13: Global Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair. 66.7% of Masters Thesis candidates were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the Thesis chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Research Methods Course (O: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11)**

The student's performance in the required M.A.-level Social Research Methods course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student's course paper or final exam grade.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for | O1: Data Collection**

<p>|            | 75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot; |
| <strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target:</strong> | <strong>Met</strong> |
|            | 100% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 62.5% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Research Reports</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 62.5% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 25% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 50% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Written Communication</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 37.5% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Writing Conventions</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 37.5% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being either &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor. 50% of students in Soci 8020 (M.A.-level Social Research Methods) were rated as being &quot;excellent&quot; by the professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Social Statistics Course (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student’s performance in the required M.A.-level Social Statistics course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student’s course paper or final exam grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Techniques</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Research Reports</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

---

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

**Course Ordering Changes**
In order for M.A.-level students to perform better in their Social Research Methods courses, Social Statistics courses, and in their Masters theses, the Sociology department has made some modifications to the ordering of M.A.-level methods and statistics courses. This re-ordering of the statistics and methods courses will require students to complete the courses in a more timely, less spread-out, manner. (Previously, students would sometimes delay their progression through the course sequences, which would affect their learning and retention.) This re-ordering will also make it easier for students without sufficient prior knowledge or coursework in these areas to take undergraduate-level prerequisite courses, without getting behind their fellow students in their graduate cohort. However, part of the reason that this objective was not met is because only three assessments were made regarding M.A. Theses this year. Of those three assessments, two were rated as "excellent" (one was rated as "good").

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Masters Thesis
  - Outcome/Objective: Data Collection
- **Implementation Description:** The re-ordering of courses has already been planned for the 2009-2010 academic year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Dawn Baunach, Director of Graduate Studies
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our Masters program has met nearly all of its goals, with only one of the many goals established by the department not being met this year. (In previous years all of our goals have been met.) Although this result might indicate that the department does not need to institute any changes, we have chosen to implement two key programmatic improvements. Both of these improvements were described in the previous answer: the reordering of the required Masters-level statistics and methods courses and an increased focus on students meeting undergraduate prerequisites before taking graduate level courses. In addition, the instructors for the Masters-level statistics and methods courses have been collaborating to improve instruction in those courses, and the instructors for the Masters-level and the Doctoral-level statistics courses have been collaborating to improve instruction in those courses.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Previously we have met all of our program goals. This year is the first time that one goal was not met. Therefore, we do not have past action plans to assess. However, we are implementing improvements based on this year's assessment.
**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The assessment has helped us identify a key area for improvement in the instruction of our graduate students. We are using this information to strengthen and increase our instruction in research methods and techniques.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Because only one goal was unmet and because we are instituting some major changes (reordering courses and coordinating courses better with their prerequisites), we believe that we will see much improvement next year.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2008-2009 Sociology PhD**
(As of: 12/12/2010 03:36 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 provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of Sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The broad knowledge of Sociology comes through coursework in a variety of substantive areas, as well as through training in research methodologies, statistics, and theory. The goals of the Department are to provide a general intellectual foundation that supports the student's analytical understanding of social life, a sound methodological background that prepares the student for social research and policy evaluation, and a rich and specialized body of knowledge that equips the student for the practice of Sociology in both the public and private sectors.

**Goals**

**G 1: Analytical Skills**
Students are expected to master appropriate analytical skills.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Students are expected to possess appropriate critical thinking skills.

**G 3: Communication Skills**
Students are expected to evidence appropriate written communication skills.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**
Students are expected to appropriately use sociological concepts, theories, information, and data sources.

**G 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**
Students are required to possess the ability to appropriately analyze pressing social problems.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 4, 5)**
The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.

**SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.

**SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1, 4, 5)**
The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 4, 5)**
The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.

**SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 5)**
The student is able to analyze and interpret data.

**SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1, 4, 5)**
The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 4, 5)**
The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Doctoral Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**
The student's original Doctoral Dissertation and Dissertation Defense are used for assessment by the Dissertation Chair.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

#### Target for O1: Data Collection
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.

#### Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.

#### Target for O3: Research Reports
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.

#### Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.

#### Target for O5: Data Analysis
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.

#### Target for O6: New Research Questions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
100% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "very good" or "excellent" by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as "excellent" by their Dissertation chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O7: Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O8: Writing Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O9: Concepts and Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O10: Facts and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O12: Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O13: Global Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2008-2009 - Target:</td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair. 83.3% of Doctoral candidates were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; by their Dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Theory Qualifying Exam (O: 9, 10, 12, 13)**

The student's performance on the Theory Qualifying Examination is used for assessment.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**

50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

**Findings** 2008-2009 - Target: **Met**

Of the 12 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 10 or 83.3% passed.

**Target for O10: Facts and Information**

50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

**Findings** 2008-2009 - Target: **Met**

Of the 12 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 10 or 83.3% passed.

**Target for O12: Social Problems**

50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 12 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 10 or 83.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Global Questions**

50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 12 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 10 or 83.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Methods Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

The student's performance on the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination is used for assessment.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Data Collection**

50% of students will pass the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 13 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 12 or 92.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**

50% of students will pass the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 13 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 12 or 92.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**

50% of students will pass the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 13 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 12 or 92.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**

50% of students will pass the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 13 students who took the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination during the 2008/2009 cycle, 12 or 92.3% passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Research Methods Course (O: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11)**

The student's performance in the required Ph.D.-level Social Research Methods course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student's course paper or final exam grade.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Data Collection**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O3: Research Reports**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O7: Written Communication**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."
The student’s performance in the required Ph.D.-level Social Statistics course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student’s course paper or final exam grade.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Research Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Formulating Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>New Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Writing Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Use of Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We have met all of our goals so we have not created an Action Plan. However, we are not resting on our laurels. We are increasing our assessment points this year, with a particular focus on instruction in social research methodologies and techniques.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This year, as with all other years, we have met all of our goals for our Doctoral program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are pleased because we have again met all of our goals for our Doctoral program. Even so, we are adding additional assessment points that will be implemented this year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Although we did not need to, we have added additional assessment points. Thus far we have met those additional assessment points. We are continuing to add more.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Because we have once again met all of our Doctoral-program goals, the assessment tells us that major changes are not necessary. However, we are implementing additional assessments to evaluate our program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Because all of our goals were met this year as in past years, the assessment does not indicate that we need much improvement. However, we have decided to increase our assessment of the Doctoral-program. This way we will be able to have a fuller, more holistic assessment of the program.

**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 Hispanic 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understanding Spoken Spanish**
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.

**G 2: Communicating Orally in Spanish**
The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical accuracy.

**G 3: Reading Texts Written in Spanish**
The student shall demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend general non-technical materials in the target language.

**G 4: Ability to Write in Spanish**
The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.

**G 5: Knowledge of Hispanic Cultures**
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with Hispanic cultures.

**G 6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures**
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with Spanish language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret literary texts, including their cultural contents.

**G 7: Knowledge of Spanish Business Concepts**
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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures (G: 3, 5, 6)**
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**

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Listening Comprehension (G: 1, 2)**
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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 2 Oral Communication
- 3 Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
**O/O 2: Speaking Ability (G: 1, 2)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation and grammatical accuracy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Oral Communication
2. Collaboration
3. Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**O/O 4: Writing Ability (G: 4)**

The student shall demonstrate the ability to write in the target language with clarity and grammatical accuracy.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research and Data Collecting Skills**

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.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills**

Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**SLO 3: Acquisition of Knowledge**

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.

**SLO 4: Effective writing, communication and editing**

Students demonstrate communicative competence in written and oral Spanish.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Direct and indirect assessment**

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 must 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

---

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

**Encourage Scholarship**

Supervise student work that can be presented at professional meetings.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Speech BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 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.

The Speech Communication curriculum is undergoing a major revision, and the mission statement will likely be changed in the next cycle, 2010-2011.

---

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: oral communication (M: 1, 2)**

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.

**O/O 2: leadership skills (M: 4, 5)**

Students will possess communication competencies necessary for effective leadership.

**O/O 3: processes, theories and research (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Students will understand the processes of human communication and their theories and how to read/conduct research relating to communication across the lifespan.

**O/O 4: critical skills (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Students will gain the critical/cognitive skills needed to be an informed citizen.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: oral presentation (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students in Spch 3210 earn a grade of 70% or better on a technical speech presentation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: oral communication
70% or higher of students Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 in Spch 3210 earn a grade of 70% or better on a technical speech presentation

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 100% of students in Spch 3210 earned a grade of 70% or better on a technical speech presentation.

M 2: oral presentation (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Student in Spch 3250 earn a score of 70% or higher on their speeches..
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: oral communication
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 70% or higher of students in Spch 3250 earn a score of 70% or higher on their oral presentations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 98% of Spch 3250 students earned a score of 70% or higher on their oral presentations.

M 3: research paper (O: 3, 4)
Students in Spch 4400 earn 70% for the grade on their final paper and earned 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: processes, theories and research
70% of students in Spch 4400 earn a grade of 70% or higher on the grade for their research papers and 70% of students earn a score of 70% or higher on the writing rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
69% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% for the grade on their final papers, and 33% of the students earned 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.

Target for O4: critical skills
70% or higher of the students in Spch 4400 earn 70% or higher for the grade on their final paper, and 70% of the students earn 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
69% of the students in Spch 4400 earned 70% for the grade on their final papers, and 33% of the students earned 70% (or higher) on the writing instrument rubric.

M 4: obervation (O: 2, 3, 4)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students in Spch 4400 earn a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: leadership skills
70% or higher of the students in Spch 4400 earn a grade of 70% or better on the observation.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
88% of the students in Spch 4400 earned a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.

Target for O3: processes, theories and research
70% or higher of the students in Spch 4400 earn a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
88% of the students in Spch 4400 earned a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.

Target for O4: critical skills
70% or higher of the students in Spch 4400 earn a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
88% of the students in Spch 4400 earned a grade of 70% or better on the observation of their oral presentation of their research.

M 5: group research project (O: 2, 3, 4)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students in Spch 4400 earned 70% or higher on the group research assignment.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O2: leadership skills**

70% or higher of Spch 4400 students earned 70% or higher on the group research assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of Spch 4400 students earned 70% or higher on the group research project assignment.

**Target for O3: processes, theories and research**

70% or higher of Spch 4400 students earn 70% or higher on the group research project assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of Spch 4400 students earned 70% or higher on the group research project assignment.

**Target for O4: critical skills**

70% of Spch 4400 students earn 70% or higher on the group research project assignment.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of Spch 4400 students earned 70% or higher on the group research project assignment.

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

**competent communicator standard**

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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: oral presentation | Outcome/Objective: oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty

**competent communicator standard**

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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: oral presentation | Outcome/Objective: oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty

**competent communicator standard**

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:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: oral presentation | Outcome/Objective: oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall semester 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty

**consistent use of 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.

**revise curriculum/assessment plan**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

**revised curriculum/assessment**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

**revision of curriculum/assessment**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

**revision of curriculum/assessment plan**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

** revision of curriculum/assessment plan**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.
Revision of Curriculum/Assessment Plan

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: group research project | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories and research

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

Revision of Curriculum/Assessment Plan

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: group research project | Outcome/Objective: critical skills

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

Revision of Curriculum/Assessment Plan

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: observation | Outcome/Objective: leadership skills

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

Revision of Curriculum/Assessment Plan

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: observation | Outcome/Objective: critical skills

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty
Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Sports Administration degree seeks to prepare graduates with professional skills and knowledge for careers in the $600-plus billion dollar sports business industry through an exceptional program inspired by excellence, vision, scholarship, leadership, and entrepreneurship. This program is one of only 34 approved masters programs in the country (out of 240-plus programs). Within this industry -- ranking as the 6th largest industry 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.

Goals
G 2: Students will gain a focused knowledge of the discipline of sport business management.
G 1: To prepare students to be successful professionals working in the sport business industry.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management. (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.

SLO 3: Sport Law
To understand and be familiar with legal aspects in sport business.

SLO 4: Sport Marketing
Demonstrate an understanding and application of sport marketing to sport business.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Financial Planning in Sport Business (M: 2, 3)
Student will be able to develop financial planning techniques applicable to the sport business industry.

O/O 5: Sport Management and Leadership
Develop an understanding of management functions and leadership aspects in sport business.

O/O 6: Socio-cultural Aspects of Sport
Students study the role and significance of sports in contemporary society, issues of a cultural nature, aspects of the human experience in sport, and the effects of and relationships with various factors, such as the media, violence, religion, and commercialization, on the sporting world.

O/O 7: xcontent (M: 1)
0: Understands socio-cultural context of sport (Final)
0: Can develop financial planning for sports (Final)
0: Describes sport management functions (Final)
0: Can conduct sport business research (Final)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Major Project (O: 1, 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.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target for O1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.
On any major project in a course, 80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher).
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Target for O7: xcontent
On a major project, 80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher).

M 2: Papers (O: 1, 2)
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.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1:** Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.

In courses that require a paper or other written assignment, 80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

**Target for O2:** Financial Planning in Sport Business

On a paper assigned in courses, 80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

**M 3: comprehensive exam/project (O: 1, 2)**

Normal dotm 0 0 1 18 106 Georgia State University 1 1 130 12.256 0 false 18 pt 18 pt 0 0 false false false A culminating all-essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content. The exams are evaluated by program faculty.

**Source of Evidence:** Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1:** Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.

Normal dotm 0 0 1 14 80 Georgia State University 1 1 98 12.256 0 false 18 pt 18 pt 0 0 false false false In a comprehensive examination, 90% of students will score a passing mark; exams are scored by specific professors.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

**Target for O2:** Financial Planning in Sport Business

Normal dotm 0 0 1 14 80 Georgia State University 1 1 98 12.256 0 false 18 pt 18 pt 0 0 false false false On the comprehensive exam, 100% of students will score a passing mark.

**M 4: Presentations (O: 1)**

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.

**Source of Evidence:** Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1:** Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.

In courses that require a presentation, 80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Not sure at this point.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Nothing has been done.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Not sure.
**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.

**Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: Demonstrates effective health Care Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of health care settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 3: Understands importance of professional Develop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional development, responsibilities, and its importance to their continued growth in their chosen field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and evaluation management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Understands and interprets current research (M: 3, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current research methods, and are able to read and interpret current research in their field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop advance proficiency in the acute care and management of activity related injury and illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Demonstrates effective health Care Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Draft/In Progress) Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of health care settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Understands importance of professional Develop. (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional development, responsibilities, and its importance to their continued growth in their chosen field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt. (M: 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and evaluation management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Professional Presentations (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To gain full understanding of professional issues, students must present a minimum of twice annually in a peer setting on a relevant professional issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Acute Care Certifications (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will obtain either AHA or Red Cross Professional CPR certification and Red Cross Emergency Responder Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Thesis or Research Project (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must complete a thesis or research project prior to graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site evaluations are performed twice yearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Case Study (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 7: Proficiency Exam (O: 6)**

Students must demonstrate clinical proficiency on therapeutic modality units.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 8: Final Competency Exam (O: 6)**

Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of curricular material

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2008-2009 academic year

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities | Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Pursuit of greater collaboration within the department, and other departments within the university. Also, begin pursuit of local community resources (e.g. CDC) and program collaboration. Continued growth of our clinical practice and integration of Evidence Based Practice based on the best available research.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The average graduation rate through the department has been about 65%. In the sports medicine program, over the last year we had a 100% pass rate on comprehensive examination. The Graduate Program in Sports Medicine boasts a 100% pass rate on the National Athletic Trainers Association (NATA-BOC) certification board exam. The program continues to have 100% placement rate upon graduation (by students that choose employment) in high quality positions. There were changes to the course content of Applied Anatomy and Orthopedic Evaluation within the scope of current curriculum to increase the clinical skills application and improve the psychomotor quality of our prepared graduates. Changes were also made to enhance student learning in orthopedic rehabilitation to become more evidence based medicine following the advancement of the profession.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Current findings on comparing relative student grading has shown an increase in student aptitude with cognitive outcomes. Students are adapting better to the ambiguity found in current research and application of EBM (promoting evidence based practice). This is especially important to the uniqueness of the Sports Medicine program. Our population is operated on the Master’s Level and students are funded by local universities and schools. The programs look to our students to keep them abreast of current literature and treatment trends as they continue to evolve. The Sports Medicine program is unique secondary to the clinical load of the graduate assistants. It combines the use of traditional education and mentorship style programming from the site location. This continues to help challenge treatment styles and philosophies to promote the best care for the athletic population. The continuing expansion of the program upon faculty expansion should lead to residency programming and potential for fellowship competencies in the future.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Sports Science PhD**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:36 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
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.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge**  
Students will gain knowledge in Kinesiology and advanced knowledge in their area of research focus

**G 2: Problem solving**  
Students will become better problem-solvers

**G 3: Skills**  
Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in research, scholarship, and teaching

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**  
Prepare graduates for careers as professors and researchers in higher education and research institutions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Faculty
- Technology
- Graduate Experience

**O/O 2: Understanding of research (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 3)**  
Graduates understand the concepts and applications of exercise physiology and biomechanics research methodology

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Faculty
- Technology
- Graduate Experience

**O/O 3: Specialization (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4)**  
Graduates of the program will have a subspecialty that strengthens their skills in their major concentration

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 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
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Grant writing and management (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates are prepared for careers that involve grant writing and management skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written 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
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
6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Cultural sensitivity (G: 3) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates are prepared to work with individuals who are culturally and individually different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
6.3 Graduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive exams and dissertation (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students pass comprehensive exams and write dissertations that contribute to the body of research literature in the exercise physiology and biomechanics fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1:</strong> Prepare for careers as professors and researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students (n=2) that sat for their comprehensive exams, passed their exams. These two students are currently developing their dissertation proposals. Two out of four doctoral candidates successfully defended their dissertations; the other two students are currently collecting their dissertation data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Research presentations (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1:</strong> Prepare for careers as professors and researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partly Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All doctoral candidates/graduates (n=6) presented research papers at professional conferences. One out of four doctoral students (non-candidates) have presented research at professional conferences; one of the other three students just started the program and a second student was out on maternity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understanding of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students will complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All doctoral candidates/graduates (n=6) presented research papers at professional conferences. One out of four doctoral students (non-candidates) have presented research at professional conferences; one of the other three students just started the program and a second student was out on maternity.

**M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)**

Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All doctoral students have passed statistics ad research design/method courses.

**M 4: Cognate (O: 3)**

Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Specialization**

100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop these skills

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Six out of ten doctoral students have completed their cognate. The other four students are at various stages of their academic program.

**M 5: Seminar and professional development (O: 4)**

Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Grant writing and management**

95% of students will meet this requirement

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Eight out of ten students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals. The other two students are at early stages of their academic program.

**M 6: Cultural and individual sensitivity (O: 5)**

Cultural and individual sensitivity will be emphasized in coursework

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O5: Cultural sensitivity**

100% of students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All doctoral students are exposed to multicultural perspectives in their coursework, class projects, and/or research.

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

**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
- **Implementation Description:** Summer 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2017
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kinesiology faculty

**Review and/or revise outcomes and measures**

Kinesiology faculty will meet regularly (e.g., monthly) to review and/or revise assessment outcomes/objectives and measures, as well as other issues related to the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Cognate | **Outcome/Objective:** Specialization
- **Measure:** Comprehensive exams and dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
- **Measure:** Cultural and individual sensitivity | **Outcome/Objective:** Cultural sensitivity
- **Measure:** Research and statistical design | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of research
- **Measure:** Research presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Kinesiology faculty will meet on a regular basis (e.g., monthly) to review and/or revise assessment outcomes and measures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have implemented the annual review of doctoral student progress and faculty continue to involve doctoral students in their research program and research studies.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Assessments indicated that students are successfully progressing through the program, learning critical knowledge and skills that prepare them for careers as professors and researchers.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
Goals have been added to the assessment program and minor modifications have been made to the assessment outcomes and measures. However, further review of current outcomes and measures is warranted. The primary operational improvement that has been made is the implementation of the annual review of doctoral student progress report by the program faculty.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
Current assessment indicate that all target levels were met, and current strategies will be continued. However, planned review of the assessment outcomes and measures may indicate the need of additional outcomes/measures to better discriminate learning outcomes in the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The Kinesiology faculty plan to meet regularly (e.g., monthly) to review assessment outcomes and measures, as well as other program issues.
Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Unknown (M: 2, 3, 4)

Unknown

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
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 6: Communication

Effectively relays ideas and responses in oral and/or written communication as it relates to the visual arts Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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 7: Contemporary Issues


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
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: Health and Safety

Carries out safe studio practices that are informed by complete knowledge of the health and safety issues in the visual arts Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 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
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: Technology
Creates work that reflects a sound knowledge of technology as it relates to visual art
Student Learning Outcome: Yes
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Active Through: 2007-2008
Entry Status: Final
Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
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
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 12: Interdisciplinary Knowledge
Employs cross disciplinary and experimental approaches in the visual arts
Student Learning Outcome: Yes
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Active Through: 2007-2008
Entry Status: Final
Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
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
1.15 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 13: Technical Skill
Demonstrates in studio work formal, perceptual, and technical skills in the visual arts
Student Learning Outcome: Yes
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Active Through: 2007-2008
Entry Status: Final
Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
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
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 14: Professional Preparation in the Arts (M: 1, 2, 5, 7)
Knowledge relating to professional practices in the visual arts as demonstrated in artist’s statement, professional resume and portfolio presentation
Student Learning Outcome: Yes
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Active Through: 2007-2008
Entry Status: Final
Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
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

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore level (M: 3)
Participates in and contributes to course group assignments and class group critiques. Students evaluated on how they perform collectively as well as individually inside the classroom. Students are also encouraged to engage in more conceptual methodology in their work.

Relevant Associations:

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
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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major (O: 14)
Written essay submitted that details information about the student's portfolio of art and why the student has chosen this art discipline.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Of 100 students evaluated, 4 scored 6 - outstanding (4%) , 25 scored 5 - excellent (25%), 39 scored 4 - very good (39%), 22 scored 3 - good (22%), 9 scored 2 - fair (9%), and 1 scored 1-poor (1%).

M 2: Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork (O: 14)
Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Of 59 students evaluated, 9 scored 6 - outstanding (15%) , 30 scored 5 - excellent (51%), 10 scored 4 - very good (17%), 8 scored 3 - good (14%), 2 scored 2 - fair (3%).

M 2: Unknown (O: 2)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Unknown
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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
Of 59 students evaluated, 9 scored 6 - outstanding (15%) , 22 scored 5 - excellent (37%), 18 scored 4 - very good (31%), 7 scored 3 - good (12%), 2 scored 2 - fair (3%) and 1 scored 1 - poor (2%).
**M 3: Foundations level portfolio artwork (O: 1, 2, 2)**

Portfolio of Artwork submitted from foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Unknown**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- Of 59 students evaluated, 8 scored 6 - outstanding (6%), 27 scored 5 - excellent (23%), 11 scored 4 - very good (33%), 7 scored 3 - good (25%), 2 scored 3 - fair (6%), and 4 scored NA.

**O2: Collaborative and Group Skills - Sophomore 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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- Of 100 students evaluated, 6 scored 6 - outstanding (6%), 25 scored 5 - excellent (23%), 32 scored 4 - very good (33%), 20 scored 3 - good (25%), 5 scored 3 - fair (6%), and 2 scored 1 - poor (2%).

**M 4: Professional Resume (O: 2)**

Professional artist resume submitted.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- Of 59 students evaluated, 9 scored 6 - outstanding (6%), 30 scored 5 - excellent (51%), 10 scored 4 - very good (33%), 8 scored 3 - good (14%), 2 scored 3 - fair (6%).

**M 5: Senior Level Final Artist Statement (O: 14)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- Of 59 students evaluated, 9 scored 6 - outstanding (15%), 30 scored 5 - excellent (51%), 10 scored 4 - very good (17%), 8 scored 3 - good (14%), 2 scored 2 - fair (3%).

**M 7: BFA Art Exhibition (O: 14)**

A group art exhibition of artwork by all BFA candidates.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**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 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

- Of 59 students evaluated, 9 scored 6 - outstanding (15%), 30 scored 5 - excellent (51%), 10 scored 4 - very good (17%), 8 scored 3 - good (14%), 2 scored 2 - fair (3%).

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

**CTW ART 3910 and CTW 4950 Portfolio II in all 7 studio disciplines**

In fall 2009 the School, BFA majors will be required to take the new gateway CTW course ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemporary...
Art as they begin the foundation level studio courses in Area G. They will also be required to take the newly designated CTW 4950 Portfolio II course as the capstone course for the major.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** BFA Art Exhibition | **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Preparation in the Arts  
- **Measure:** Essay on artwork and reason for selecting major | **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Preparation in the Arts  
- **Measure:** Portfolio of Foundation Level Artwork | **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Preparation in the Arts  
- **Measure:** Senior Level Final Artist Statement | **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Preparation in the Arts

**Implementation Description:** Fall semester 2009  
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All Studio faculty in 7 discipline areas of Photography, Textiles, Interior Design, Graphic Design, Sculpture, Drawing/Painting/Printmaking, Ceramics

**Additional Resources:** As demand for our CTW gateway course ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemporary Art increases after 2010, additional faculty may be needed to cover this demand.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Since we were not able to pilot our CTW courses for the Studio Art major in 2008-09, we will monitor closely the results of changes to our 4950 Portfolio II courses to determine if the CTW aspect of the class is reflected in higher scores for the Professional Preparation in Art objective. And having instituted the Critical Issues through Contemporary Art as a requirement of the BFA Studio Art major at the entry level, we should also see improved scores in the Contemporary Issues objective as our Portfolio II students exit the program.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We created a new gateway CTW course for the BFA Studio Art major entitled Critical Issues In Contemporary Art. It is designed to introduce BFA Studio Art majors to the critical issues and debates relevant to contemporary art and creative practice. The course investigates theoretical discourse, art history and cultural revolutions that shaped the art of the 1990s through today. Students are introduced to a variety of critical methodologies such as formalism, feminism, post structuralism and post colonialism through lectures, selected readings, slide presentations, video screenings, visits to exhibitions and presentation by guest artists. Art in a variety of media is examined to illustrate current critical issues that affect artists in their studio production. Student will debate and clarify issues through verbal and written analysis, interpretation and comparison of the visual material and the readings. The goal is to impact the critical thinking of students at the beginning of their studio experience via this academic class so that greater evidence of critical thinking is reflected in their subsequent studio practice. We also designated our capstone course 4950 Portfolio II as a CTW course. Critical thinking through writing is demonstrated through writing exercises that culminate in a final written project/artist statement supportive of the final portfolio of studio work for Senior Exhibition. We also have standardized across all studio art disciplines the requirement of a professional packet consisting of a resume, project statement and digital documentation in support of the final portfolio project. In this way, we are assured that all students are trained in producing support materials for their studio work that meet professional standards and are exiting our program with these materials in hand.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our findings indicate significant growth in technical skills from entry level to completing the major in Portfolio II. There also is substantial growth in collaborative group skills, which we attribute to our adoption of a new foundation course, Introductory Studio, and a new intermediate level course, Digital Possibilities. Both courses are populated with students from across the 7 studio disciplines and require students to work together to execute group projects. However, while the Introductory Studio is a new requirement for the major and, therefore, is consistently fully enrolled, the Digital Possibilities is an elective and does not always have strong enrollment. With collaborative skills as an objective for the BFA Studio Art major, it is important that we encourage a greater number of studio majors to take this course as one of their electives.

---
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---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Studio Art MFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible graduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields. We address this mission in the following ways: ✪ Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills ✪ Expand students understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts ✪ Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world ✪ Engage and collaborate with
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Cross Disciplinary Knowledge (M: 5)

Cross Disciplinary and experimental approaches to studio practice

#### 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
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
- 2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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: Research and Critical Thinking (M: 4)

High Level of competence in one medium including relevant technical, historical and critical theory 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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### SLO 3: Professional Skills (M: 1, 2, 3)

Professional skills relating to all aspects of presentation of own artwork.

#### 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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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: Advanced Research Skills

The ability to do advanced research in studio practice with regard to context, history contemporary issues, materials and techniques

#### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 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 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
- 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
### SLO 5: Communication

Broad awareness of contemporary art and critical issues

### Institutional Priority Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, &amp; innovation</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit, retain &amp; graduate high quality graduates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Portfolio (O: 3)

Graduate final portfolio of artwork completed during final two years of program of study including thesis year work.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009**  -  **Target**: Partially Met

Of 12 students evaluated, 5 scored 6 - outstanding (42%), 6 scored 5 - excellent (50%), 1 scored 4 - very good (8%).

#### M 2: Portfolio (O: 3)

Graduate final portfolio of artwork completed during final two years of program of study including thesis year work.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009**  -  **Target**: Partially Met

Of 12 students evaluated, 5 scored 6 - outstanding (42%), 6 scored 5 - excellent (50%), 1 scored 4 - very good (8%).

#### M 3: Professional Resume (O: 3)

Professional artist resume highlighting educational and professional accomplishments

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: 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 2008-2009**  -  **Target**: Partially Met

Of 12 students evaluated, 5 scored 6 - outstanding (42%), 6 scored 5 - excellent (50%), 1 scored 4 - very good (8%).

#### M 4: Thesis Paper (O: 2)

Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: 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 2008-2009**  -  **Target**: Partially Met

Of 12 students evaluated, 5 scored 6 - outstanding (42%), 6 scored 5 - excellent (50%), 1 scored 4 - very good (8%).

#### M 5: Unknown (O: 1)

Unknown

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: 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 2008-2009**  -  **Target**: Partially Met

Of 12 students evaluated, 4 scored 6 - outstanding (33%), 6 scored 5 - excellent (51%), 1 scored 4 - very good (8%). For 3 students it was NA
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Formation of 3-D program

The Ceramics area and Sculpture area will join to form a 3-D program. This will allow students from both disciplines to enroll in the same Directed Study and Graduate Seminar course under the direction of one faculty member. By forming a larger critical mass of students, they will experience richer and more diversified feedback in their group critiques as well as more exposure to the possibilities of creative problem solving in their studio practice.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Research and Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** Ceramics and Sculpture faculty are in the process of refining the details of a 3-D program yet are moving forward by joining the two disciplines in one Directed Study course this semester. By Fall 2010 all details should be resolved and in full operation.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mark Burleson, Christina West, Ruth Stanford, George Beasley

#### Graduate Program Review

A Graduate Program review is scheduled for 2009 - 2010. A committee has been formed and will be chaired by Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine. Topics for consideration are: increasing cross disciplinary interaction and instruction among studio disciplines, expanding attendance and participation in graduate studio critiques to include faculty and students from all studio disciplines, reducing the isolation of graduate students in their respective studio areas and increasing their experience of other graduate students’ research activities, and devising program opportunities for graduate students to have greater exposure to practicing contemporary artists excelling in the field.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
- Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Research and Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** The review of the Graduate Program will take place throughout this academic year with the intent of implementing any changes in Fall 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:** What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

The 3-D Program conversion is in process with the Ceramics and Sculpture faculty meeting regularly with Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine. The Graduate Program Review committee is scheduled to meet in the month of October to establish priorities and goals for the year.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Discussions between the Ceramics area and Sculpture area have led to combining the two areas to form an overarching 3-D program. This will enrich the graduate experience for those students creating with 3-D materials. It will provide a needed critical mass of students for strengthening the group critique process and will result in increased sharing of creative problem solving skills among Ceramic and Sculpture students and faculty alike. It also will encourage greater resource sharing and encourage students to work more freely across these two disciplines.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:** What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

While the findings of our assessment indicate that our students are performing well in our graduate program, we are interested in taking a close look at structure of our graduate studio program to see if there are other models of operation that would better suit our goals. Graduate Program Review will begin this fall semester with the formation of a committee comprised of a representative from each studio discipline.
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: To develop ability to conduct tax research
Expected outcomes of above stated program objectives: (1) The student should be able to identify tax issues; (2) The student should be able to locate relevant authority for resolving tax issues; (3) The student should be able to correctly cite primary tax authority. (4) The student should be able to document research findings and conclusions. The assessment method for this learning objective is performance on project in Tax Research (Tx 8030).

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

SLO 3: To develop effective communication skills
The expected outcome for the above stated objective is that the student should be able to communicate effectively in writing and orally. The assessment method for the expected outcome will be performance in Effective Communication (BCom 8250).

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

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We are going to add more writing and presentation projects to both Tx 8020 and Tx 8030. We are also considering to a pre and post test on research knowledge in Tx 8030.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
In our required introduction course we now mandate case presentations by students. In addition we require the students to complete a casebook with their briefs.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We are contemplating excluding BCom 8250 from the program. It could be taken as an elective but possibly not a required course.

Annual Report Section Responses
International Activities
The MTx program is unique in that it offers two study abroad courses each year. The first study abroad in international taxation travels to Greece and Turkey. This course compares traditional European business practices in taxes with that of Sharia law and...
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Teaching & Learning EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals
G 1: G1: Develop Education Experts in Concentrations

G 2: G2: Develop Education Experts, Inquirers & Leaders

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development (G: 1) (M: 1)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are committed to student learning and development.

O/O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.

O/O 3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development (G: 1) (M: 3)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate responsibility and expertise in managing and monitoring student learning and development.

O/O 4: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.

O/O 5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities (G: 1, 2) (M: 5)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning (O: 1)
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 1.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Learning (O: 2)**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning (O: 3)**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 3.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**M 4: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect (O: 4)**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**M 5: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities (O: 5)**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 5.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

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

**Future of Ed.S.**

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Future of Ed.S.**

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to
We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of Spring Semester 2010
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have addressed last year’s Action Plan in the following ways: 1. Core Content and Delivery. We have re-sequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses (i.e., part face-to-face, part online). We have continued to discuss the possibility of fully online options of the core courses, but because of the tentative nature of the future of the Ed.S. program, we have delayed making the investment in creating online courses. We have also considered incorporating the Teacher Support Specialist courses into the program, but again, we have not moved forward with this due to the tentative nature of the future of the program. 2. Increase Recruitment and Retention. We have completely updated the relevant sections of the MSIT website for the Ed.S. degree. However, several sections of the College of Education website remain outdated (e.g., the OAA site). We have sent changes/updates that are needed to the appropriate individuals, but updates are not yet completed. We have begun to offer orientation sessions (program-specific and department-wide) for new Ed.S. students. We also continue to advise students formally twice a year in MSIT’s Professional Advisement Week (PAW). In 2009-2010, several Ed.S. concentrations have increased in enrollment.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
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.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Our most important accomplishments in the Ed.S. for this year are that 2008-2009 assessment targets were met, enrollments increased slightly, and website materials were updated, and new student orientations were added.

Challenges for Next Year
We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
N/A

Modifications in Measurement Methods
N/A

University-wide Committee Participation
The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**Publications and Presentations**
The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**Academic Teaching Activities**
The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**International Activities**
We have a large number of Ed.S. students in Teaching and Learning who are international students. MSIT boasts 12 international faculty in the department. Multiple international research, teaching, and service activities are in progress.

**Contributions to Student Retention**
For the Ed.S. degree, we now hold new student orientations that are program-specific and department-wide. We also advise students formally twice a year during Professional Advisement Week (PAW). Each individual Ed.S. student works closely with a faculty advisor/mentor.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Teaching & Learning PhD**

As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 PM EST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Develop Researchers in Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished graduates of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning degree program will demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: O1: Research Competence (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **O/O 2: O2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education (M: 2)** |
| The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today. |

| **O/O 3: O3: Creates New Knowledge in Major (M: 3)** |
| The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry. |

| **O/O 4: O4: Extensive Knowledge of Major Field (M: 4)** |
| The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry. |

| **O/O 5: O5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area (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. |

| The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators. |
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: M1: Faculty Rating of Research Competence (O: 1)**
A summary rating describing the candidate's 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Target for O1: O1: Research Competence**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated research competence in at least one research paradigm. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating of Foundational Knowledge (O: 2)**
A summary rating describing the candidate's foundational knowledge 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Target for O2: O2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major (O: 3)**
A summary rating describing the candidate's scholarship within the major 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Target for O3: O3: Creates New Knowledge in Major**
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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated the creation of new knowledge and scholarship in his/her discipline or major. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 4: M4: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Major (O: 4)**
A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the major 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Target for O4: O4: Extensive Knowledge of 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an extended knowledge base in the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 5: M5: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Cognate (O: 5)**
A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the cognate area will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members...
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.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O5: O5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an extended knowledge base in a cognate area associate with the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 6: M6: Faculty Rating of Identity and Contributions (O: 6)**

A summary rating describing the candidate's professional identity and his/her contributions to the profession 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.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O6: O6: Professional Identity and Contributions**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated a professional identity through his/her contributions to the community of scholars. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 7: M7: Faculty Rating of Teaching and Prof Dev (O: 7)**

A summary rating describing the candidate's teaching and professional development 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.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O7: O7: Teaching and 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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional development in the major discipline of inquiry. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**M 8: M8: Faculty Rating of Technology Skills (O: 8)**

A summary rating describing the candidate's technology skills 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.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O8: O8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry**

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 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an in-depth understanding of and expertise in technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

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

**Tracking Our Graduates’ Positions in Higher Ed**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: End of Spring Semester 2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Department Faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We will continue to document the types of academic and research appointments of our graduates each year and strive to increase the percentage of graduates who pursue positions in higher education or other research-oriented positions.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
All assessment targets were met for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning. In 2008-2009, eleven (11) students graduated from the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program. Five (5) of these graduates now hold positions in higher education (e.g., American University in Cairo, Georgia Tech, Kennesaw State University, University of Louisiana-Lafayette, University of North Florida). The others hold teaching or other professional positions in schools or school systems in the Atlanta metro area.

Challenges for Next Year
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

Modifications in Measurement Methods
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

University-wide Committee Participation
Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Publications and Presentations
Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Academic Teaching Activities
Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a
major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

**International Activities**

We have a large number of Ph.D. students in Teaching and Learning who are international students. MSIT boasts 12 international faculty in the department. Multiple international research and teaching activities are in progress. One Ph.D. graduate accepted a faculty appointment at the American University in Cairo for 2009-2010.

**Contributions to Student Retention**

Each Ph.D. student works closely with an academic advisor and mentor, but all Ph.D. students participate in formal Professional Advisement Week (PAW) twice a year. Many Ph.D. students participate in virtual mentoring with faculty and advanced graduate students through online technologies.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Urban Policy Studies BS**

*As of: 12/13/2016 03:36 PM EST*

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Understand policy and politics in American cities**

Students can demonstrate their understanding of the politics and policy in the American city.

**G 2: Understand critical policy issues**

Students can demonstrate their understanding of critical policy issues.

**G 3: Working with policy data**

Students can demonstrate the ability to work with policy data.

**G 4: Evaluate public policy**

Students can demonstrate their ability to evaluate public policy.

**G 5: Understand policy analysis**

Students can demonstrate their understanding of policy analysis.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies.

**SLO 2: Describe important policy issues facing cities (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Student will be able to demonstrate ability to describe important policy issues facing cities.

**SLO 3: Complete an urban policy writing assignment (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment.

**SLO 4: Describe the components of the public policy process (G: 2) (M: 4)**

Students will be able to describe the components of the public policy process. This is measured by examinations and a final class presentation.

**SLO 5: Describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society (G: 2) (M: 5)**

Student must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.

**SLO 6: Apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues (G: 2) (M: 6)**

Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes (G: 2) (M: 7)**

Students demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes.

**SLO 8: Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 3) (M: 8)**

Students demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.

**SLO 9: Demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment (G: 3) (M: 9)**
Students demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

**SLO 10: Demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation (G: 3) (M: 10)**

Students demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation.

**SLO 11: Demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues (G: 3) (M: 11)**

Students demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues.

**SLO 12: Demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 4) (M: 12)**

Students demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets.

**SLO 13: Demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions in public policy (G: 4) (M: 13)**

Students demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions in public policy.

**SLO 14: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 14)**

Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**SLO 15: Demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities (G: 5) (M: 15)**

Students demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for government involvement.

**SLO 16: Demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy (G: 5) (M: 16)**

Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.

**SLO 17: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis (G: 5) (M: 17)**

Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Demonstrate understanding of contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies (O: 1)**

Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies. This is done on two examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Understand contributions of the social sciences to the interdisciplinary field of urban policy studies**

85% or more of students will show at least a partial demonstration of the knowledge/skill.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M 2: Demonstrate ability to describe important policy issues facing cities (O: 2)**

Students will be able to demonstrate ability to describe important policy issues facing cities. This is measured by two research papers, a government meeting report, and a political cartoon.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Describe important policy issues facing cities**

85% of students will at least partially demonstrate the knowledge/skills.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 84.4% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
M 3: Demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment (O: 3)

Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to complete an urban policy writing assignment. This is measured on three field trip reports, two research papers, and a government meeting report.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Complete an urban policy writing assignment

85% of students will at least partially demonstrate the skills/knowledge.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 68% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 4: Describe the components of the public policy process (O: 4)

Students will be able to describe the components of the public policy process.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Describe the components of the public policy process

85% or more of students will at least partially demonstrate the knowledge/skills for this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 91% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 5: Describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society (O: 5)

Students must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society. This is measured by policy debates and examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society

85% or more of students will at least partially demonstrate the skill/knowledge for this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 90% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 6: Demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues (O: 6)

Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the examinations and the final class presentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O6: Apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues

85% or more of students will at least partially demonstrate the knowledge/skill for this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 7: Demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes (O: 7)

Students demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the students’ final class presentations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O7: Demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes

85% or more of students will at least partially demonstrate the skill/knowledge related to this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
### M 8: Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (O: 8)

Students demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research. This is measured by the midterm and final examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 92% of students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

90% of students at least partially met this objective.

### M 9: Demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment (O: 9)

Students demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment. Students produce an evaluation research design as the final writing project for the course.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O9: Demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

87% of students at least partially met this objective.

### M 10: Demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation (O: 10)

Students demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation. This is demonstrated on the midterm and final examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O10: Demonstrate ability to define the links among ethics, politics, and theory in public policy evaluation**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

87% of students at least partially met this objective.

### M 11: Demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues (O: 11)

Students demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues. This is measured on the two examinations and the research design project.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O11: Demonstrate their understanding of how to apply the scientific method to policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

87% of students at least partially met this objective.

### M 12: Demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 12)

Students demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets. This is indicated by performance on the midterm and final examinations.
### Target for O12: Demonstrate understanding of basic concepts of measures and data sets

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of students at least partially met this objective.

---

### M 13: Demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions in public policy (O: 13)

Student demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions in public policy. This is measured using quizzes, in-class exercises, and examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O13: Demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions in public policy**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students at least partially met this objective.

---

### M 14: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 14)

Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis. This is measured using quizzes, in-class exercises, and examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O14: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

91% of students at least partially met this objective.

---

### M 15: Demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities (O: 15)

Students demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities as well as other justifications for government involvement. These are measured using quizzes and two examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O15: Demonstrate understanding of concepts such as market failure, public good, and externalities**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met**

76% of students at least partially met this objective.

---

### M 16: Demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy (O: 16)

Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. These are measured using a term paper and two examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O16: Demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
74% of students at least partially met this objective.

M 17: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis (O: 17)
Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured using a final term paper and two examinations.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
74% of students at least partially met this objective.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
There will be no action plan related to the BS degree in Urban Policy Studies for the coming year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Based on extensive discussions by the faculty, the BS in Urban Policy Studies degree was discontinued. No new students will be admitted, and current students will be encouraged to complete degree requirements or switch to the BS in Public Policy degree.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The faculty decided to discontinue the BS in Urban Policy Studies degree program since it did not regard urban policy as an appropriate theme for the degree. The goal of understanding urban policy and politics is no longer a part of the mission and goals of the BS degree in Public Policy.
G 5: Understand microeconomics for public policy
Students will understand basic principles of microeconomics for use when analyzing public policy.

G 6: Understand local government management
Students will understand the challenges of governing urban areas.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate ability to categorize policies (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to categorize policies in different ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrate ability to use major sources of literature for urban policy research (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their ability to access and utilize the major sources of literature for urban policy research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate understanding of different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of history of urban planning (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate ability to understand and apply important issues and techniques of planning practice (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of important issues and be able to apply techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrate appropriate application of several models of planning processes (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their ability to apply several models of planning processes, including roles for professional planners and citizens, and consider their appropriateness under different circumstances, and their implications for outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of fundamental political processes and institutions (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Demonstrate ability to define and identify market failures (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to define and identify market failures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Demonstrate ability to identify and analyze methods of collective action (G: 3) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to identify the issues associated with collective action and to analyze the methods used to achieve it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth (G: 3) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 4) (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results (G: 4) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers (G: 4) (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 5) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLO 17: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 5) (M: 17)
Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.

SLO 18: Demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public (G: 5) (M: 18)
Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public sector decision-making.

SLO 19: Demonstrate ability to describe the basic tools of government intervention in the economy (G: 5) (M: 19)
Students demonstrate ability 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.

SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance (G: 6) (M: 20)
Students demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance.

SLO 21: Demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government (G: 6) (M: 21)
Students demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government.

SLO 22: Demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance (G: 6) (M: 22)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance

SLO 23: Demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance (G: 6) (M: 23)
Students will demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance and possible approaches to solving these problems.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Demonstrate ability to categorize policies (O: 1)
Demonstrate ability to categorize policies. This is measured by means of two examinations.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Demonstrate ability to categorize policies
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 2: Demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies (O: 2)
Demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies. This is measured by the midterm examination and first homework assignment.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 3: Demonstrate their ability to access and utilize the major sources of literature for urban policy research (O: 3)
Students will demonstrate their ability to access and utilize the major sources of literature for urban policy research. This is assessed by means of the main paper required for the course, as well as class presentations.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Demonstrate ability to use major sources of literature for urban policy research
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2008-2009</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making. This is assessed using the final examination and the second homework assignment.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Demonstrate an understanding of the history of urban planning (O: 5)</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of urban planning in the United States and the legal and administrative context in which planning takes place. This is measured on the midterm examination.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Demonstrate understanding of important issues and be able to apply techniques of planning practices (O: 6)</strong></td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of important issues and be able to apply techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts. This is measured on the two examinations and the term paper.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Demonstrate their ability to apply several models of planning processes (O: 7)</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate their ability to apply several models of planning processes, including roles for professional planners and citizens, and consider their appropriateness under different circumstances, and their implications for outcomes. This is assessed on the two examinations and the paper.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Demonstrate an understanding of the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions (O: 8)</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level. This is measured using the midterm exam and writing assignments.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of fundamental political processes and institutions**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill, 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective. 17 of the students received a ranking of 5; 4 received a ranking of 4; and 1 received a ranking of 3 from the professor.

**Target for O9: Demonstrate ability to define and identify market failures**

Students will demonstrate the ability to define and identify market failures. This is measured on the final examination. The knowledge or skill is measured on the two examinations and the term paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective. 14 students received a ranking of 5; 4 received a ranking of 4; and 3 received a ranking of 3 from the professor.

**Target for O10: Demonstrate ability to identify and analyze methods of collective action**

Students will demonstrate the ability to identify the issues associated with collective action and to analyze the methods used to achieve it. This is measured on the two examinations and the term paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective. All of the students received a rating of 5 from the professor.

**Target for O11: Demonstrate understanding of theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth. This is measured by the final examination and the term paper.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective. 17 of the students received a ranking of 5; 1 received a ranking of 4; and 1 received a ranking of 3 from the professor.

**Target for O12: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets**

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets. This is measured using problem sets and the final exam.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

All of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective. 17 of the students received a ranking of 5; 4 received a ranking of 4; and 1 received a ranking of 3 from the professor.
M 13: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 13)

Students will demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis. This is measured using problem sets and the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O13: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

99% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 14: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly (O: 14)

Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly. This is measured using exam #3 as well as the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O14: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

99% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 15: Demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques (O: 15)

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers. This is measured using exams #1 and 2.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

92% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 16: Demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (O: 16)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: Demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

93% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

M 17: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 17)

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm examination and final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target for O17: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 18: Demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 18)**

On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O18: Demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 19: Demonstrate their ability to describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy (O: 19)**

Students will demonstrate their ability to describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy on the final examination and course paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O19: Demonstrate ability to describe the basic tools of government intervention in the economy**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 20: Demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance (O: 20)**

Students demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance. This is measured using the midterm examination and final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O20: Demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 21: Demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government (O: 21)**

Students demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government. This is measured by the midterm and final examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O21: Demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 22: Demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance (O: 22)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance. This is measured by the final examination and term paper.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O22:** Demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**M23:** Demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance (O: 23)

Students will demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance and possible approaches to solving these problems. This is measured on the final examination and the term paper.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O23:** Demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 85% of students will at least partially demonstrate their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

93% of the students at least partially demonstrated their knowledge/skill in meeting this objective.
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
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
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Students employ critical perspectives in education (M: 2)

Students will employ normative, interpretative and critical perspectives in education. Students will effectively use pedagogies appropriate for economically disenfranchised children to increase academic achievement. Students will also use strategies from proven instructional programs that have produced excellence in urban educational settings. These students will also draw on the best practices of effective leaders in urban education, business and communities to ensure the academic success of diverse groups of students.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

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
4.43 Effective utilization of resources
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Students will design, develop and implement action research in their classrooms and schools. (M: 1, 3)

Students will 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. Student will also design and conduct a major research study.

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching standards have as one of its core propositions that teachers critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen their knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills and incorporate new findings into their practice. The Standards for Advance Programs in Educational Leadership state that candidate 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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

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
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Practicum Project Rubric, Reading, Presentation (O: 1, 3)

EPEL7680 - 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 to roles of leadership (0-10 pts.), and a research proposal on school improvement action research (0-35 pts.).

EPS 8970A - Students are graded on presentation (45-50 pts.) and participation (0-50 pts.).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Students will perform as change agents in schools.

80-90 percent of the students will earn 90-100 points on the practicum project and presentations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students performed above the targeted performance level.

Target for O3: Students will design, develop and implement action research in their classrooms and schools.

80-90 percent of the students will earn 90-100 points on the research papers and presentations.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students were above the targeted performance level.

M 2: Course Activities - Papers, Projects, Presentations (O: 2)

EPSF7120 - Students are graded on interview papers (0-20 pts.), peer-reviewed group presentations (0-25 pts.), and position papers (0-35 pts.).

EPSF 7450 - Students are graded on reform model curriculum presentation (0-15 pts.), history of curriculum timeline (0-10 pts.), history of curriculum paper (0-15 pts.), and curriculum position paper (0-25 pts.).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Students employ critical perspectives in education

80-90 percent of the students will earn 90-100 points on all assignments in EPSF 7120.
80-90 percent of the students will earn 90-100 points on all assignments in EPSF 7450.
80-90 percent of the students will receive a grade of "S" in EPS 7990.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students were above the targeted performance level.

M 3: Research Project (O: 3)

These applied courses and the assignments are action oriented. In EPRS7910 - Students are graded on: research journal (20 pts.), exam (20 pts.), action research project (60 pts.), and action research report (0-20 pts.).

In EPS 7990 the students earn credit for supervised development and preparation of the master's project. Students receive an "S", "IP" or "F".

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Students will design, develop and implement action research in their classrooms and schools.

80-90 percent of the students will receive 160-150 points in EPRS 7910.
80-90 percent of the students will receive a grade of "S" in EPS 7990.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
85 percent of the students were above the targeted performance levels.

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

EPY 8250
Because of transitioning of program faculty, this course (psychology of the inner city child) is no longer offered. As a result, students...
in the program are encouraged to take sociology of the inner city child in order to have experiences related to the challenges faced by inner city children.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High

### Experiences in Other Urban Areas

Students in the UTL program will have the opportunity to participate in a summer study of urban schools systems in other cities in the United States and abroad. Currently, faculty is planning for school visits in Chicago, IL, in Summer 2010, and London, England, in Summer 2011. By taking part in these experiences, students will have a broader understanding of how systems can vary greatly in how they address student needs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium

### Maintain and Monitor

Faculty will continue to implement the program as designed, while monitoring all current student learning outcomes in the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty members

### Practicum (EPEL 7680A and 7680B) Requirements

Because of changes to programs in the educational leadership unit, the requirements and assignments for EPEL 7680a and EPEL 7680b were modified to better support the roles required of school leaders and teacher leaders. EPEL 7680A now focuses on preparing students better understand data. EPEL 7680B now focuses on action research and specifically, research designed to give educators a stronger understanding of their own cultural proficiency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The unit intends to continue working together to monitor the program and make continuous changes based on the information gathered from that monitoring.

#### ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since last year's report, the content of EPEL 7680A and EPEL 7680B has changed. Additionally, students no longer take Psychology of the Inner City Child. Instead, they take Sociology of the Inner City Child.

#### ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings of our assessment indicate that students are gaining a strong level of proficiency on the indicators we have targeted. As a result of our belief that students could benefit greatly from a knowledge of how education systems work in other urban areas, a programmatic enhancement of an optional summer immersion into other urban school systems is being added to the program for Summer 2010.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

The removal of Psychology of the Inner City Child from the program of study has impacted the program. This change was necessitated by the passing of Dr. Asa Hilliard. While the expertise he shared could never be replaced, adding Sociology of the Inner City Child to the program's suggested course listing has helped to fill a gap that has undoubtedly benefitted the students.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings of this year's assessment will help faculty members as they work together to continue to improve the overall program.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The faculty will continue to work together toward program improvement. Further, we will start surveying students at the program's end regarding their thoughts on the course of study. Adding the student perspective to the data we already collect will help us further improve.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2008-2009 Women's Studies Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

Goals
G 1: 1) Develop Critical Thinking Skills
Students should develop critical thinking skills, which include the ability to read and write clearly and carefully, and they should be able to evaluate and analyze claims presented in various textual sources.

G 2: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives
Students should develop a basic understanding of broad feminist/womanist interdisciplinary perspectives.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Intersectionality (G: 2) (M: 1)
Demonstrate conceptual understanding of the intersections among oppressions, including sexism, racism, imperialism, homophobia, and classism.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
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 2: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 1)
Apply feminist/womanist perspectives to contemporary sociocultural issues

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

SLO 3: Evidence (G: 1) (M: 1)
Use appropriate evidence to develop a written argument

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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Analysis Papers (O: 1, 2, 3)
The analytic paper should develop a clear and persuasive argument, with a focused, specific thesis statement, solid organization and development, clear and sufficient evidence; it should also demonstrate appropriate grammar and syntax. The paper should also display students's knowledge of and ability to apply feminist/womanist knowledge and perspectives to their chosen topic.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Intersectionality
Our achievement target is for 75% of students to receive a 3 or higher, with 50% of students receiving a 4 or 5.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met
We found that 89% of our students had a 3 or higher, which does meet our target, but only 39% received a 4 or 5, which does not meet our target. This finding suggests that sufficient students are achieving some competence, but less than we would like are exceeding basic competence.

Target for O2: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives
Our achievement target is for 75% of students to receive a 3 or higher, with 50% of students receiving a 4 or 5.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met
We found that 96% achieved a 3 or higher in demonstrating their ability to display feminist/womanist perspectives. Furthermore, 82% achieved a 4 or 5, which significantly exceeds our target for achievement in this category.

Target for O3: Evidence
Our achievement target is for 75% of students to receive a 3 or higher, with 50% of students receiving a 4 or 5.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Not Met
We found that 71% of our students received a 3 or above, which does not quite meet our achievement target, and only 18% received a 4 or 5 on the rubric, which does not meet our target achievement. This is the outcome that our students had the most difficulty with, which suggests that we should focus on helping them improve their ability to provide sufficient evidence for their arguments.

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

Add additional rubric
After we have completed our collection of personal narrative papers, we will include an additional rubric: Students connect what they learn to lived experience.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

Collect additional measures
We intend to collect personal narratives in addition to the analysis papers for our evaluation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Julie Kubala, director of undergraduate studies

Develop materials to enhance writing instruction
I am presently in the process of collecting materials to enhance writing instruction in the classroom. I have a draft of these materials that I piloted in 2 courses last semester, but given the small sample size, it is unclear whether these materials have actually improved student performance. We are hoping that by increasing writing instruction in the classroom, we will help students develop their writing skills, particularly in terms of the collection of evidence.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3: What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?
We intend to increase the collection of samples to include personal narrative papers. Also, we intend to develop materials to increase writing instruction.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?
Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We are attempting to increase writing instruction in the classroom. In general, students are doing well on the learning outcomes that involve content, but they are having a more difficult time with those that involve critical thinking and writing. In particular, students seem to be having a difficult time with utilizing appropriate evidence to sufficiently develop and support their points.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

These findings mean that the department is doing an excellent job of effectively communicating the information that we think it is important for students to learn. They become quite skilled in approaching questions from womanist/feminist perspectives, and they are improving in terms of their ability to see gender issues as intersectional, that is, as imbricating with issues of race, nationality, class, sexuality, etc. We do not, at this point in time, see programmatic and curriculum decisions as necessary, although we are working to develop materials to aid writing instruction in the classroom.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2008-2009 Womens Studies BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:36 PM EST)

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

### Mission / Purpose

Women’s Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university’s broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women’s Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

### Goals

**G 1: New and innovative ideas**
To develop innovative approaches to relevant issues and debates within the field.

**G 2: Critical Thinking through Writing**
To be able to display critical thinking through writing skills, such as organizing material clearly, developing ideas clearly and carefully, and providing sufficient evidence for claims.

**G 3: Demonstrate knowledge of field**
Demonstrate the knowledge of and ability to use appropriate interdisciplinary theoretical perspectives within the fields of feminist/womanist scholarship.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Research Questions (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist/womanist scholarship.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Evidence (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills by providing sufficient evidence for claims and developing their arguments clearly and carefully.
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 3: Organization (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills by organizing their papers, both in terms of structuring their paragraphs as well as structuring the entire paper in a clear and coherent fashion.

Students should demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills by organizing their papers, both in terms of structuring their paragraphs as well as structuring the entire paper in a clear and coherent fashion.

**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 4: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 3) (M: 1)**
Students should be able to demonstrate their knowledge of appropriate interdisciplinary feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives in their written work.

**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
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Application of skills (G: 3) (M: 1)**
Students should be able to demonstrate their ability to apply the theoretical perspectives and interdisciplinary skills that they have learned in the field, in both written and other types of work.

**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
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students shall write a final paper, on a topic that they will determine that is relevant to the class and approved by the professor, that utilizes the knowledge and applies the skills learned in the class in order to develop an innovative approach to a particular question in the interdisciplinary fields of feminist/womanist scholarship. Additionally, students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment; these skills include thesis development, organization, support for claims, and clear, concise writing, following appropriate grammar and syntax.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Research Questions**
We evaluated the papers on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is Poor, 2 is Fair, 3 is Good, 4 is Excellent, and 5 is Outstanding. (These rubrics were carefully defined for the committee.) Our target is for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
According to our committee, all students received a 4 or 5 on this outcome. Although our target was met, we would like a higher percentage of 5s than 4s.

**Target for O2: Evidence**

We evaluated the papers on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is Poor, 2 is Fair, 3 is Good, 4 is Excellent, and 5 is Outstanding. (These rubrics were carefully defined for the committee.) Our target is for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms of this outcome, 82% of the students achieved at least a 3, and 55% received a 4 or 5.

**Target for O3: Organization**

We evaluated the papers on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is Poor, 2 is Fair, 3 is Good, 4 is Excellent, and 5 is Outstanding. (These rubrics were carefully defined for the committee.) Our target is for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

On this rubric, 82% of students scored a 3 or higher, with 45% scoring a 4 or 5. This was the finding that was the lowest of our scores, which indicates that we still have considerable work to do in terms of aiding students to strengthen their critical thinking through writing skills.

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**

We evaluated the papers on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is Poor, 2 is Fair, 3 is Good, 4 is Excellent, and 5 is Outstanding. (These rubrics were carefully defined for the committee.) Our target is for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**

On this outcome, 100% of the students scored a 4 or 5, which meets our achievement target and suggests that students are performing better in terms of demonstrating their knowledge than they are in terms of displaying their writing skills.

**Target for O5: Application of skills**

We evaluated the papers on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is Poor, 2 is Fair, 3 is Good, 4 is Excellent, and 5 is Outstanding. (These rubrics were carefully defined for the committee.) Our target is for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met**

On this outcome, 100% of students achieved a 3 or higher, though only 91% achieved a 4 or 5.

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

**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.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: Medium
- **Implementation Description**: ongoing
- **Projected Completion Date**: 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Core faculty
- **Additional Resources**: time

**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.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: Medium
- **Implementation Description**: ongoing
- **Projected Completion Date**: 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Core faculty
- **Additional Resources**: time

**Modify assessment**

Departmental Conversation about evaluators’ interpretations of measures and/or the measures themselves

- **Established in Cycle**: 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: Medium
- **Implementation Description**: Ongoing
- **Projected Completion Date**: 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group**: Core faculty
- **Additional Resources**: Time
Early intervention

We are designating our 3010 course, Feminist Theories, as a Critical Thinking Through Writing Course, which should focus attention on student writing earlier in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty (Many of us teach WSt 3010)

Increase critical thinking through writing skills

Given that our assessment targets were not met in two particular areas: organization and evidence, it appears that our students are having the most difficulty in terms of critical thinking through writing skills. Hopefully, given that students will need to take a CTW course earlier in their careers, that will help students improve in these areas. Until the CTW is fully operational, we can work to increase writing instruction throughout our upper-level courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Core Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

I think I answered that question in Question 2. I'm not quite sure how to differentiate between the two questions.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

One change that we have made is that we have designated WSt 3010, Feminist Theories, a Critical Thinking through Writing class. We are hoping that by focusing on writing instruction in more detail earlier on, that students' scores will increase in the areas which need most work, which are the areas of developing appropriate evidence and organization, which actually was the lowest of our scores. Since these assessment reports suggest that students are doing a much better job of acquiring content than they are of developing their writing skills, we have implemented some changes in order to further develop their writing skills, through early intervention.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are discussing several other changes within the department. First, we are talking about increasing the sorts of assignments that we assess, in order to more fully understand the strengths and weaknesses of the students. Secondly, I will collect and initiate discussions about the sorts of rubrics that we as faculty are using in our assignments. Through this collection and discussion, I want to ensure that we are all in agreement about the learning outcomes, even if we emphasize different aspects of them in the different classes, and even though we represent a wide variety of pedagogical strategies. Third, I think we need more conversation about our measures, as well as our interpretations of them. Since the undergraduate committee, which evaluates the measures, is not the same as the core faculty, we hope that this variety will enable us to expand our conversation about how we do our assessment. Depending on the results of these conversations, we might also decide to collate some descriptions/assignments in terms of how we do writing instruction in the classroom. We hope that a more focused attention on the writing process will aid in our students ability to organize carefully and provide detailed and sufficient evidence for their writing.
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 Gender (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 other 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
3.32 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 to 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 sitting comprehensive exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Theory**
All students passing the exam question on this topic or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All four (4) students taking the comprehensive exam during the 2008-2009 exam cycle passed the exam question on this topic or passed it with revisions and completed the revisions successfully.

**Target for O2: Globalization and Gender**
All students passing the exam question on this topic or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All four (4) students taking the comprehensive exam during the 2008-2009 exam cycle passed the exam question on this topic or passed it with revisions and completed the revisions successfully.

**Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements**
All students passing the exam question on this topic or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All four (4) students taking the comprehensive exam during the 2008-2009 exam cycle passed the exam question on this topic or passed it with revisions and completed the revisions successfully.

**Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology**
All students passing the exam question on this topic or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All four (4) students taking the comprehensive exam during the 2008-2009 exam cycle passed the exam question on this topic or passed it with revisions and completed the revisions successfully.

**Target for O5: Original Research Project in Women's Studies**
All students passing the exam question on this topic or passing with revisions then completing the revisions successfully.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
All four (4) students taking the comprehensive exam during the 2008-2009 exam cycle passed the exam question on this topic or passed it with revisions and completed the revisions successfully.

**M 2: Master's Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students will create 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.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Feminist/Womanist Theory**
Student theses reflect knowledge about one or more of the following topics: feminist/womanist theory; globalization and women/gender; feminism/womanism and other social movements; feminist/womanist research methodology.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Both students who successfully wrote and defended a thesis during the 2008-2009 reporting cycle reflected knowledge of feminist/womanist theory, globalization and women/gender, feminism/womanism and other social movements, or feminist/womanist research methodology in their thesis projects.

**Target for O2: Globalization and Gender**
Student theses reflect knowledge about one or more of the following topics: feminist/womanist theory; globalization and women/gender; feminism/womanism and other social movements; feminist/womanist research methodology.

**Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met**
Both students who successfully wrote and defended a thesis during the 2008-2009 reporting cycle reflected knowledge of feminist/womanist theory, globalization and women/gender, feminism/womanism and other social movements, or feminist/womanist research methodology in their thesis projects.
Target for O3: Feminism/Womanism and Other Social Movements

Student theses reflect knowledge about one or more of the following topics: feminist/womanist theory; globalization and women/gender; feminism/womanism and other social movements; feminist/womanist research methodology.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Both students who successfully wrote and defended a thesis during the 2008-2009 reporting cycle reflected knowledge of feminist/womanist theory, globalization and women/gender, feminism/womanism and other social movements, or feminist/womanist research methodology in their thesis projects.

Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Research Methodology

Student theses reflect knowledge about one or more of the following topics: feminist/womanist theory; globalization and women/gender; feminism/womanism and other social movements; feminist/womanist research methodology.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Met

Both students who successfully wrote and defended a thesis during the 2008-2009 reporting cycle reflected knowledge of feminist/womanist theory, globalization and women/gender, feminism/womanism and other social movements, or feminist/womanist research methodology in their thesis projects.

Target for O5: Original Research Project in Women's Studies

All students successfully writing and defending a thesis.

Findings 2008-2009 - Target: Partially Met

Two (2) students successfully wrote and defended a thesis during the 2008-2009 reporting cycle.

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

More Students Defend Thesis On-Time

Our target is for M.A. students to defend their theses within 2.5 years of beginning the M.A. program. During the 2008-2009 reporting cycle, two students defended their theses -- one on-time and the other off by one semester. However, several student whose timelines should have had them defending during this academic year did not. Our action plan is to get more students to write and defend their theses on-time via better utilization of notification and encouragement mechanisms. Both students and their faculty advisors need to be notified about timeliness of student progress and encouraged to meet timeliness targets.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Master's Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Original Research Project in Women's Studies

Implementation Description: By the time this report is completed again, presumably June 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Because we are transitioning between Graduate Directors during Summer 2009, we will save these discussions as a faculty for Fall 2009.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?

Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As per last year's action plan, post-thesis proposal defense students were monitored for timely progress. One monitored student completed the thesis as a result. Several other students continue to be monitored.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are doing a good job with the students who complete their work. In other words, students are learning the material well and demonstrating their learning in their comprehensive exams and thesis. Our challenge area is students with "life situations" that perpetually intervene upon their school work and timely progression through the program. Our department must devise strategies for both supporting students in need and being appropriately disciplinary with students who are not making adequate progress.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Now that we have fully transitioned into our new comprehensive exam procedure/timetable (first proposed two years ago), we now experience a more orderly process for our department, students and faculty alike.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

It is about the same as before, neither more nor less useful than our previous methods of tracking our progress.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Our department sees clearly that the biggest need for ingenuity and improvement is in the area of facilitating students’ timely progress through the program and ultimate completion to the point of graduation.